A DISCOURSE OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST, IN THE TWO GREAT POINTS OF THE Real Presence AND THE Adoration of the Host.

IN ANSWER to the TWO DISCOURSES lately Printed at OXFORD on this SUBJECT.

To which is prefixed A Large HISTORICAL PREFACE relating to the same ARGUMENT.

The Second Edition.

LONDON, Printed for Richard Chiswell, at the *Rose* and *Crown* in S. *Paul's* Church-Yard. MDCLXXXVIII.

BIBL. CANT. ASAPH

Imprimatur.

Ex Æd. Lamb. Feb. 14. 1686.

Guil. Needham RR^mo in Chriſto P. ac D.D. Wilhelmo Archiep. Cant. à Sacris Domeſt.

A DISCOURSE OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST, IN THE TWO GREAT POINTS OF THE Real Presence AND THE Adoration of the Host.

IN ANSWER to the TWO DISCOURSES lately Printed at OXFORD on this SUBJECT.

To which is prefixed

A Large HISTORICAL PREFACE relating to the same ARGUMENT.

The Second Edition.

LONDON,

Printed for **Richard Chiswell**, at the *Rose* and *Crown* in S. *Paul's* Church-Yard. MDCLXXXVIII.

706:02

THE PREFACE.

THE *nature of the Holy* Eucharist *is a ſubject that hath been ſo frequently inſiſted upon, and ſo fully explain'd both in our own and other Languages, that it may well be thought a very needleſs undertaking for any one to trouble the World with any farther* Reflections *upon it. For not to mention now thoſe Eminent Men who have heretofore labour'd in this work, nor to run beyond the points that are here deſign'd to be examined; What can be ſaid more evidently to ſhew the impoſſibility of the pretended* ſubſtantial change *of the* Bread *and* Wine *into the* Body *and* Blood *of Chriſt in this Holy Sacrament, than has been done in the late excellent* Diſcourſe againſt Tranſubſtantiation? *It is but a very little time ſince the Adoration of the Hoſt has been ſhewn not only to be a novel invention, contrary to the practice of all Antiquity, but the danger of it evidently demonſtrated, notwithſtanding whatever pretences can be made of a* good intention *to excuſe them from the charge and danger of Idolatry, who continue the practice of it. And both theſe not only ſtill remain unanſwer'd; but if we may be allow'd to judge either*

by their own ſtrength, or by our Adverſaries ſilence, are truly and indeed unanſwerable.

It is not therefore out of any the leaſt Opinion that any thing more need be ſaid to confirm our cauſe, much leſs that I eſteem my ſelf able to undertake it with the ſame ſucceſs that thoſe other Champions of our Faith have done it, that I venture theſe Diſcourſes *to a publick view. But ſince our* Adverſaries *ſtill continue, without taking notice of any of theſe things, to cry up their Great* Diana *no leſs than if ſhe had never at all been ſhewn to be but an* Idol, *I thought it might not be amiſs to revive our Inſtances againſt it: And that we ought not to appear leſs ſollicitous by a frequent repetition of our Reaſons, to keep Men in the* Truth, *than others are by a continual inſiſting upon their ſo often baffled* Sophiſtry, *to lead them into* Error.

'*Twas an ingenious Apology that* Seneca *once made, for his often repeating the ſame things*; 'That he did 'but inculcate over and over the ſame Counſels, to 'thoſe that over and over committed the ſame faults: *And I remember an antient Father has left it as his Opinion, that it was uſeful for the ſame truths to be vindicated by many,* 'becauſe that one Man's Writings 'might poſſibly chance to come where the others did 'not; and what was leſs fully or clearly explain'd by 'one, might be ſupplied and enlarged by the other. *And a greater than either of theſe, S.* Paul, *has at once left us both an example and a warrant for this ſollicitude*; *Phil.* 3. 1. 'To write the ſame things to you, 'to me (*ſayes he*) is not grievous, but for you it is 'ſafe.

Indeed I think if there be any need of an excuſe for this undertaking, it ought to be rather to Apologize *for a far*

far greater abſurdity which we all commit in writing at all againſt thoſe Men, who in theſe Diſputes concerning the Holy Sacrament, have moſt evidently ſhewn that to be true of Chriſtians, which was once ſaid of the antient Philoſophers, That there can be nothing ſo abſurd, which ſome Men will not adventure to maintain.

In moſt of our other Controverſies with thoſe of the Church of Rome, *we ſhew them to be* Erroneous; *in this they are* Extravagant; *And as an eminent Pen has very juſtly expreſs'd it.* 'The buſineſs 'of *Tranſubſtantiation* is not a Controverſie of *Scri-* 'pture againſt *Scripture*, or of *Reaſon* againſt *Rea-* 'ſon, but of downright *Impudence* againſt the plain 'meaning of *Scripture*, and all the *ſenſe* and *reaſon* 'of mankind. Diſcourſe againſt Tranſubſtantiation, Pag. 2.

The truth is, as the ſame Perſon goes on, 'It is a 'moſt ſelf-evident falſhood: and there is no Do- 'ctrine or Propoſition in the World that is of it 'ſelf more evidently true, than Tranſubſtantiation 'is evidently falſe. *And if ſuch things as theſe muſt be diſputed, and this Evidence,* 'That what we 'ſee and handle, and taſte to be Bread is Bread, 'and not the Body of a Man; and what we ſee and 'taſte to be Wine is Wine, and not Blood, may 'not paſs for ſufficient without any farther Proof, 'I cannot diſcern why any Man that hath but 'confidence enough to do ſo, may not deny any 'thing to be what all the World ſees it is, or af- 'firm it to be what all the World ſees it is not, 'and this without all poſſibility of being further 'confuted. Ibid.

But

But yet ſince it has pleaſed God ſo far to give over ſome Men to a ſpirit of deluſion, as not only ſeriouſly to believe this themſelves, but alſo raſhly to damn all thoſe that cannot believe it with them, we ought as well for the ſecurity of thoſe who have not yet abandoned their own ſenſe *and* reaſon, *in compliance only with others who in this matter profeſs to have laid aſide* theirs; *as in charity to ſuch deluded Perſons as are unhappily led away with theſe Errors, to ſhew them their unreaſonableneſs: To convince them that Chriſtianity is a* wiſe *and* rational Religion: *that 'tis a miſtaken Piety to ſuppoſe that Men ought to believe* Contradictions; *or that their* Faith *is ever the more perfect, becauſe the Object of it is impoſſible: That our* Senſes *ought to be truſted in judging aright of their proper Object; that to deny this is to overthrow the greateſt external Evidence we have for our Religion, which is founded upon their judgment: or if that will be more conſiderable, is to take away all the grounds that even themſelves can pretend to, wherefore they ſhould disbelieve them in favour of* Tranſubſtantiation.

And this I perſwade my ſelf I have in the following Diſcourſe ſufficiently ſhewn, and I ſhall not need to repeat it again here. For the words *themſelves, which are the grounds of this great Error, I have taken that* Method *which ſeemed to me the moſt proper to find out the true meaning of them; and, as far as the nature of the Enquiry would permit, have endeavour'd to render it plain and intelligible even to the meaneſt Capacity. And I have ſome cauſe to hope that the moſt learned will not be diſſatisfied with the deſign, what ever they may be with*

the

the performance; it being from ſuch that I have taken the greateſt part of my Reflections, *and in which I pretend to little of my own beſides the care of putting together here, what I had obſerved ſcattered up and down in parts elſewhere.*

It was ſo much the more fit at this time to inſiſt upon this manner of arguing, in that a late diſturber of the Fathers, the better to ſhew the Antiquity *of his* new Religion, *has pretended to ſearch no leſs than into the ſecrets of the Jewiſh* Cabala *after it, and to have found out* Tranſubſtantiation *there amongſt the reſt of the* Rabbinical Follies: *Now however the very name of* Galatinus *be ſufficient to Learned Men to make them eſteem his Judgment in his* Jewiſh *to be much the ſame as in his* Chriſtian Antiquity *which follows after, in thoſe eminent pieces of* S. Peter's *and* S. Matthew's Liturgies, S. Andrew's *work of* the Paſſion of our Lord; Dionyſius's Eccleſiaſt. Hierarch. *&c. yet becauſe ſuch ſtuff as this may ſerve to amuſe thoſe who are not acquainted with the emptineſs of it, I was ſo much the rather inclined to ſhew what the* true *notions of the* Jewiſh *Rites would furniſh us with to overthrow their pretences; and that the* Rabbins Viſions *are of as little moment to confirm this conceit as* their own Miracles. *Conſenſus Veterum p. 21, &c.* *Ibid. p. 27.*

But whatever thoſe of the other Communion *ſhall pleaſe to judge of my Arguments, yet at leaſt the Opinions of thoſe eminent Men of their own* Church *may certainly deſerve to be conſider'd by them, who have freely declared that there is not in Scripture any evident proof of* Tranſubſtantiation; *nay ſome of whom have thought ſo little engagement upon them either from that or any other Authority to believe it,*

that they have lived and died in their Church without ever embracing of it.

* *Traitté d'un Autheur de la Communion Romaine touchant la Transubſtantiation.* Lond. 1686.

And of this the late Author of the * Hiſtorical Treatiſe of Tranſubſtantiation, *and which is juſt now ſet forth in our own Language, may be an eminent inſtance, being a Perſon at this day living in the* Communion *of the* Church of Rome, *and in no little Eſteem among all that know Him. It is not fit to give any more particular character of Him at this time. They who ſhall pleaſe to peruſe his Book, will find enough in it to ſpeak in his Advantage; and if they have but any tolerable diſpoſition to receive the truth, will clearly ſee, that this point of* Tranſubſtantiation *was the production of a blind and barbarous Age; unknown in the Church for above one thouſand Years, and never own'd by the greateſt Men in any Ages ſince. The truth is, if we enquire preciſely into this buſineſs of* Tranſubſtantiation, *we ſhall find the firſt foundation of it laid in a Cloyſter by an unwary Monk about the beginning of the 7th* Century: *carried on by a Cabal of Men, aſſembled under the name of a* (*a*) General Council *to introduce* the worſhip of Images *into the Church*, Ann. 787. (*b*) *formed into a better ſhape by another* (*c*) Monk Ann. 818. *and He too oppoſed by almoſt all the Learned Men of his Age; and at laſt confirmed by a* (*d*) Pope *of whom their own Authors have left us but a very indifferent* (*e*) *character; and in a* (*f*) Synod *of which I ſhall obſerve only this, that it gave the* Pope *the power of* unmaking Kings, *as well as the* Prieſts *that of* making their God.

About 636 or 640. See *Blondel de l'Euchariſtie. c.* 14. *p.* 365.

(*a*) 2. *Concil. Nic.*

(*b*) *Blondel. l. c. cap.* 18. *pag.* 426.

(*c*) *Paſchaſius Radbertus.*

(*d*) See the Treatiſe of Tranſubſtantiation; Hiſt. of the 9*th.* Age.

(*e*) *Innocent.* III *Super omnes mortales ambitioſus, & ſuperbus, pecuniæque ſititor inſatiabilis, & ad omnia ſcelera pro præmiis datis vel promiſſis cereus & proclivis.* Matt. Pariſ. (*f*) *Concil. Lateran.* IV. *Can.* 3. *de Hæreticis.*

But

But indeed I think we ought not to charge the Council *with either of theſe Attempts; ſince contrary to the manner of proceeding in ſuch* Aſſemblies, *received in all Ages, nothing was either judged or debated by the* Synod *:* † *The* Pope *only himſelf formed the* Articles, *digeſted them into* Canons, *and ſo read them to the* Fathers; *ſome of which, their own* Hiſtorian *tells us, approved them, others did not, but however all were forced to be contented with them.*

† *His omnibus congregatis in ſuo loco præfato, & juxtà morem Conciliorum generalium in ſuis Ordinibus ſingulis collocatis, factio. prius ab ipſo Papâ exhortationis ſermone, recitata ſunt in pleno Concilio capitula* LXX. *quæ aliis placabilia, aliis videbantur onroſa.* Matt. Pariſ. *ad Ann.* 1215. See this confirmed by *Monſieur du Pin. Diſſert.* VII. *Pariſ.* 4° 1686. *pag.* 572, 573.

Such was the firſt riſe of this new Doctrine; 1215 *years after Chriſt. But ſtill the moſt learned Men of that and the following Ages doubted not to diſſent from it.* (*a*) Aquinas *who wrote about* 50 *years after this definition, ſpeaks of ſome, who thought* the ſubſtantial form of the Bread ſtill to remain after Conſecration: (*b*) Durandus *doubted not to aſſert* the continuance of the Matter of the Elements, whatever became of the form; *and that 'twas* (*c*) raſhneſs to ſay that Chriſt's Body could be there no otherwiſe than by Tranſubſtantiation: *To which* (*d*) Scotus *alſo ſubſcribed,* that the truth of the Euchariſt might be ſaved without Tranſubſtantiation, (*e*) *and that in plain terms ours was the* eaſier, *and* to all appearance the truer interpretation of Chriſt's words; *in which* (*f*) Ockam *and* (*) d'Alliaco *concurr'd with him.* (*g*) Fiſher *confeſs'd that* there was

(*a*) See 3. q. 75. Art. 6. *Utrum factâ conſecratione remaneat in Hoc Sacramento forma ſubſtantialis Panis?*

(*b*) *In* 4. *d.* 11. *q.* 9. *Quid ergo dicendum de* converſione ſubſtantiæ Panis in Corpus Chriſti? *Salvo meliori judicio, poteſt æſtimari, quod* SI *in iſto Sacramento fiat* Converſio ſubſtantiæ Panis in Corpus Chriſti, *quod ipſa fit per Hoc quod corruptâ* formâ *Panis,* materia *ejus ſit ſub* formâ Corporis Chriſti.

(*c*) *Id. in* 4. *diſt.* 11. *q.* 4. *Art.* 14. (*d*) *Scotus in* 4. *diſt.* 11. *q.* 3. (*e*) *Id.* 4. *ſent. d.* 11. *q.* 3. (*f*) *Ockam in* 4. *q.* 6. (*) *Alliaco in* 4. *q.* 6. *art.* 2 (*g*) *Contr. cap. Babyl. exp.* 10.

nothing to prove the true presence of Christ's Body and Blood in their Mass: (a) Ferus *would not have it inquired into*, How Christ's Body is there; *and* (b) Tonstall *thought it were better* to leave Men to their Liberty of belief in it. *Those who in respect to their Churches definition did accept it, yet freely declared that* (c) before this Council it was no matter of Faith, nor but for its decision would have been now; That the Ancients did not believe it; that the Scripture does not express it; *in short*, that the interpretation which we give is altogether as agreeable to the words of Christ, *and in truth* free from infinite inconveniences with which the other abounds. *All which plainly enough shews that not only the late* private 'Heretical Spirit, whose imperious sentiments, and 'private Glosses, and contradictory interpretations '(*as a late* * *Author has elegantly expressed it*) 'like the victorious Rabble of the Fishermen of 'Naples riding in triumph, and trampling under 'foot Ecclesiastical Traditions, Decrees, and Con'stitutions, Ancient Fathers, Ancient Liturgies, 'the whole Church of Christ, but especially 'those words of his, This is my Body, *has opposed this Doctrine; but even those who are to be supposed to have had the greatest reverence for all these, their own* Masters *and* Doctors, *found it difficult to embrace so* Absurd *and* Contradictory *a Belief.*

And here then let me beseech those into whose hands these Papers may chance to fall, seriously to consider this matter, and whether the sole Authority *of such a* Pope *as* Innocent III. *whose actions towards one of our own Kings, and in favour of that very ill Man* Dominick *and his* Inquisition, *were there*

(a) *Ferus in Matt. 26. Cum certum sit ibi esse* Corpus Christi, *quid opus est disputare, num* Panis substantia maneat, vel non?

(b) *Lib. 1. de Eucharistiâ:* See the Treatise of Transubstantiation, 1. part.

(c) *Vid. Bellarm. de Euch. l. 3. c. 23. p. 767, 768. Suarez in 3. part. D. Th. vol. 3. disp. 50. p. 593, 594. Cajetan. in 3. D. Th. q. 75. art. 1. Scotus, l. c. 4. Sent. d. 11. q. 3. Vid. etiam Ockam, Alliac. loc. supr. cit.*

* *Consensus Veterum Pag. 27.*

there nothing elſe remaining of his Life, might be ſufficient to render him deteſtable to all good Men, ought to be of ſo great an Authority with us as to engage us to give up our ſenſes *and our* reaſon; *nay and even* Scripture *and* Antiquity *it ſelf, in obedience to his arbitrary and unwarrantable* Definition.

It is I ſuppoſe ſufficiently evident from what has been before obſerved, how little aſſurance their own Authors had, for all the definition *of the* Council of Lateran, *of this Doctrine. I ſhall not need to ſay what debates aroſe among the* Divines *of the* Council of Trent *about it. And though ſince its determination there, Men have not dared ſo openly to ſpeak their Minds concerning it as before, yet we are not to imagine that they are therefore ever the more convinced of its Truth.*

I will not deny but that very great numbers in the Roman Communion, *by a* profound ignorance *and a* blind obedience, *the two great* Goſpel perfections *with ſome Men, diſpoſed to ſwallow any thing that the* Church *ſhall think fit to require of them, may ſincerely profeſs the belief of this* Doctrine; *becauſe they have either never at all conſidered it, or it may be are not capable of comprehending the impoſſibility of it. Nor ſhall I be ſo uncharitable as to ſuppoſe that all, even of the* learned *amongſt them, do wilfully profeſs and act in this matter, againſt what they* believe *and* know *to be* true.. *I will rather perſwade my ſelf that ſome motives or prejudices which I am not able to comprehend, do really blind their eyes, and make them ſtumble in the brightneſs of a mid-day light. But yet that all thoſe, who nevertheleſs continue to live in the external* Communion *of the* Church of Rome, *are not thus*

ſincere

ſincere in the belief of it, is what I think I may without uncharitableneſs affirm; and becauſe it will be a matter of great importance to make this appear, eſpecially to thoſe of that Perſwaſion; I will beg leave to offer ſuch proofs of it as have come to my knowledge, in ſome of the moſt eminent Perſons *of theſe* laſt Ages, *and to which I doubt not but others, better acquainted with theſe ſecrets than I can pretend to be, might be able to add many more* Examples.

And the firſt that I ſhall mention is the famous † Picherellus, *of whom the teſtimonies prefix'd to his Works ſpeak ſo advantagiouſly, that I ſhall not need ſay any thing of the eſteem which the learned World had of him.* * *I muſt tranſcribe his whole Treatiſe ſhould I inſiſt on all he has delivered repugnant to their Doctrine of* Tranſubſtantiation. *Suffice it to obſerve that in his Expoſition of the words of Inſtitution,* This is my Body, *He gives this plain interpretation of them,* This Bread is my Body *which is both freely allowed by the Papiſts themſelves to be inconſiſtent with their belief as to this matter; and which he largely ſhews not only to be his* own, *but to have been the conſtant* Doctrine *of the* Primitive Fathers *in this point.*

But in this it may be there is not ſo much ground for our admiration, that one who was not very fond of any of the Errors *of that* Church, *ſhould openly diſſent from her in this: It will more be wondred that a perſon ſo eminent amongſt them as* Cardinal *du* Perron, *and that has written ſo much in defence of*

† *Petri Picherelli Expoſitio Verborum inſtitutionis Cœnæ Domini.* Lugd. Batav. 1629. 12°.

* Hoc eſt Corpus meum, *i. e. Hic panis fractus eſt Corpus meum.* pag. 10. Hoc eſt Corpus meum, *i. e. Panis quem frangimus eſt communio cum Corpore Chriſti. pag.* 14. — and pag. 27. Expounding *Gratian. diſt. 2. Can. Non Hoc Corpus,* Ipſum Corpus inviſibiliter, *de vero & germano Corpore in Cœlis agente intelligitur*: Non ipſum viſibiliter *de Corpore & ſanguine Sacramentalibus*, Pane & Vinò; Corporis *Chriſti & ſanguinis ſymbolis: Quæ rei quam ſignificant nomen per ſuperadditam metonymiam mutuantur.*

of Tranſubſtantiation, *ſhould nevertheleſs all the while Himſelf believe nothing of it. And yet this we are aſſured he freely confeſs'd to ſome of his Friends not long before his death: That he thought the Doctrine to be* MONSTROUS; *that he had done his endeavour to* COLOUR *it over the beſt He could in his Books; but that in ſhort he had undertaken an* ILL CAUSE, *and which* WAS NOT TO BE MAINTAIN'D. *But I will ſet down the relation as I find it in* Monſieur Drelincourt's * *Anſwer to the* Landgrave *of* Heſſe; *and who would not have preſum'd to have offer'd a* relation *ſo* conſiderable, *and to a perſon of ſuch* Quality, *had he at all fear'd that he could have been diſproved in it.* '† *Your* 'Highneſs (*ſays He*) *may believe me if you pleaſe:* 'But *I can aſſure you with all ſincerity and truth that if* 'the *late* Cardinal *du* Perron *has convinced you of the* 'Truth *of* Tranſubſtantiation, *he has convinced you of* 'that *of which he could never convince himſelf, nor* 'did *he* ever believe it. *For I have been informed by* 'certain *Perſons of Honour, and that are in all re-* 'ſpects worthy of belief, *and who had it from thoſe that* 'were eye witneſſes; *That ſome friends of that Illu-* 'ſtrious *and learned* Cardinal *who went to ſee him* 'as he lay languiſhing *upon his Bed, and ill of that di-* 'ſtemper *of which he died, deſired him to tell them* 'freely, *what he thought of* Tranſubſtantiation: *To* 'whom he anſwer'd, That it was a MONSTER. *And* 'when they farther ask'd him, How then he had written

* *Reponſe à la Lettre de Monſig. le Prince Erneſt aus cinq Miniſtres de Paris, &c.* Geneve 1664.

† *Votre Alteſſe me croira s'il luy plait. Mais je luy puis dire avec toute ſincerité & verité, que ſi le defunt* Cardinal *du* Perron *luy a perſuadé la* Tranſubſtantiation, *il luy a perſuadé ce qu'il n'a pû ſe perſuader à ſoy-méme, & qu'il n'a* nullement cru. *Car je ſcay par des Gens d'Honneur & dignes de foy, qui l'avoient apris de temoins oculaires, que des Amis de cet illuſtre & ſcavant* Cardinal, *qui l'eſtoient allé viſiter lors qu'il eſtoit languiſſant en ſon lit, & malade de la maladie dont il eſt mort, le prierent de leur dire franchement ce qu'il croyoit de la* Tranſubſtantiation, *& qu'il répondit, qu'il la tenoit pour un* Monſtre. *Et comme ils luy demanderent, comment donc il en avoit écrit ſi amplement & ſi doctement; il repliqua, qu'il avoit deployé toutes les Adreſſes de ſon Eſprit pour* colourer *cet abus, & pour le rendre plauſible; & qu'il avoit fait comme ceux qui font tous leurs Efforts pour* defendre une mauvaiſe Cauſe.

'ſo

'ſo copiouſly and learnedly about it? He replied, That 'he had done the utmoſt that his Wit and Parts had ena- 'bled him, to COLOUR OVER THIS ABUSE and 'RENDER IT PLAUSIBLE; But that he had done like 'thoſe who employ all their force to defend an ILL 'CAUSE. And thus far Monſieur Drelincourt. I could to this add ſome farther circumſtances which I have learnt of this matter, but what is here ſaid may ſuffice to ſhew what the real Opinion of this great Cardinal, after all his Voluminous Writings, as to this Doctrine was; unleſs ſome future Obligations ſhall perhaps engage me to enter on a more particular account of it.

To theſe two great inſtances of another Nation I will beg leave to ſubjoyn a third of our own Country: Father Barnes the Benedictine, who in his Pacific Diſcourſe of moſt of the points in Controverſie between us and the Papiſts, expreſly declares, 'That the As- 'ſertion of Tranſubſtantiation, or of the ſubſtan- 'tial change of the Bread, though it be indeed the 'more common Opinion, is yet no part of the 'Churches Faith: And that the Scripture and Fa- 'thers, when they ſpeak of a μετουσία may be ſuffi- 'ciently Expounded of that admirable and ſuper- 'natural change of the Bread, by the preſence of 'Chriſt's Body added to it, without the departure 'of the ſubſtance of the Bread it ſelf.

Catholico-Romano-Pacificus Oxon. 1680. Pag. 90. *Aſſertio* Tranſubſtantiationis *ſeu mutationis ſubſtantialis panis, licet ſit* Opinio communior, *non tamen eſt* fides Eccleſiæ. *Et Scripturæ & Patres docentes μετουσίαν, ſufficienter exponi poſſunt de admirandâ & ſupernaturali mutatione Panis per Præſentiam Corporis Chriſti ei accedentem, ſine ſubſtantialis Panis deſitione.* Et. P. 95. Μετουσίαν illam in *Auguſtiſſimo Sacramento factam, plerique graves & antiqui Scriptores ita explicant, ut non fiat per* deſitionem ſubſtantiæ panis, *ſed per receptionem ſupernaturalem ſubſtantiæ Corporis Chriſti in ſubſtantiam Panis.* V. pl.

It appears by theſe words how little this Monk *thought* Tranſubſtantiation *an* Article of Faith. *But a greater than he, and who not only did not eſteem it neceſſary*

neceſſary for Others, *to receive it, but clearly ſhews that he did not believe it himſelf, is the Illuſtrious* Monſieur de Marca, *late* Archbiſhop *of* Paris, *and well known to the World for his great Learning and Eminence. His Treatiſe of the* Euchariſt *was publiſh'd with Authority, by one of his near Relations the* Abbé Faget *at* Paris 1668. *with ſome other little Tracts which he had received from the* Archbiſhops *own hands. In the cloſe of that Treatiſe he thus delivers his* Opinion: '† The ſpecies of the Bread is 'in its Eſſence and Nature diſtinct from the Body 'of Chriſt adjoyn'd to it, although the reaſon of 'the Euchariſt requires that the inward ſubſtance 'of the Bread ſhould be converted into that Body 'after a manner that exceeds all Imagination. But 'yet this change hinders not but that the BREAD 'which is ſeen ſtill RETAINS its own NATURE, 'BEING, and ESSENCE, or SUBSTANCE, toge-'ther with the proprieties of its true Nature, 'among which one is the faculty of nouriſhing our 'Bodies, *&c.* Whence it follows that it was rightly 'obſerv'd by *Gelaſius*, that the Sacrament of the 'Body and *Blood* of Chriſt was a *Divine thing*, 'becauſe the *Bread* and *Wine* being perfected by

Illuſtriſſ. atqu Reverend P. de Marca Pariſienſ. Archiep. Diſſertationes Poſthumæ. De Sanctiſſimæ Euchariſtiæ Sacramento diſſertatio, in fine.

† *Species* Panis *eſt* Eſſentiâ & Naturâ diſtincta à Corpore Chriſti *ſibi adjuncto, licet ratio Euchariſtiæ id exigat, ut* ſubſtantia Panis interior *converſa fuerit in illud* Corpus *modo quodam qui omnem cogitationem exſuperat. Cæterum mutatio illa non officit quin* Panis, *qui videtur,* [id eſt, Accidentia] *ſuam* Naturam, Extantiam & Eſſentiam [SIVE SUBSTANTIAM] *retineat, & naturæ veræ Proprietates, inter quas eſt alendi corporis* humani facultas——. *Unde conſequitur rectè obſervatum à* Gelaſio, *Sacramenta* Corporis & Sanguinis *Chriſti divinam rem eſſe, quia* Panis & Vinum *in* divinam *tranſeunt* ſubſtantiam, *S. ſpiritu perficiente, nempe in* Corpus Chriſti ſpiritale: *ſed ex alia parte non deſinere* ſubſtantiam & naturam Panis & Vini, *ſed ea permanere in* ſuæ proprietate Naturæ. *Quoniam ſcil. poſtquam* Panis *in divinam ſubſtantiam tranſiit,* [NON INTERIIT INTEGRA PANIS NATURA QUAM SUBSTANTIAM QUOQUE VOCAT, NEC DESIVIT: SED] *in ſuæ proprietate Naturæ permanſit ad alendum Corpus idonea, quod eſt præcipuum conſecti panis munus. Note,* That in the *Paris Edition,* they have put in thoſe words printed in the Black Letter (*id eſt Accidentia*) and omitted thoſe that I have cauſed to be ſet in *Capitals*: But in the *Original leaf*, which I have left in S. *Martin*'s Library to be ſeen by any that pleaſes, and which was cut out for the ſake of this paſſage, it ſtands as I have ſaid: and as it is truly repreſented in the *Holland Edition.*

'the *Holy Spirit* paſs into the *Divine Subſtance*, *viz.* 'the *ſpiritual Body of Chriſt*; but on the other ſide, 'that the SUBSTANCE and NATURE of the BREAD 'and WINE do not ceaſe to be, but continue ſtill, 'in the *propriety* of their own *Nature*.

And here I ſuppoſe any one who reads this paſſage alone of this Treatiſe, might without the help of * Monſieur Baluze's *Animadverſion eaſily have concluded*, 'That if this be indeed the work of 'Monſieur de Marca, 'twill be impoſſible to hinder 'him from paſſing with many Perſons for a 'HERETICK as to the point of the *Euchariſt*. *But before I quit this Inſtance, I cannot but obſerve with reference to this* Treatiſe, *what care the* Romaniſts *take to hinder the ſentiments of learned Men in this Point from coming to a publick knowledge: And which might give us ſome cauſe to ſuſpect, that their great concern is not ſo much whether they do indeed believe* Tranſubſtantiation *themſelves, as not to let the World know that they do not.*

* Baluze 2. *Lettre à Monſieur le preſid.* Marca. *S'il eſt vray, ce que j'ay de la peine a croire, que ſon* Monſeigneur *ait compoſé les Traittez que* M. Faget *a fait imprimer ſous ſon nom, dont il ſe vante dans la* Preface *& dans la Vie d'avoir les* Originaux *eſcrits de la main de l'*Auteur, *nous ne ſcaurions empeſcher que ſeu* Monſigneur *ne paſſe dans l'Eſprit de beaucoup de Gens pour* HERETIQUE, *au ſujet de l'*Euchariſtie.

This has been heretofore ſhewn in another Treatiſe *with reference to S.* Chryſoſtom; *whoſe* * Epiſtle *to* Cæſarius *ſome of the* Sorbonne Doctors *cauſed moſt ſhamefully to be cut out of* Monſieur Bigot's *Edition of* Palladius, *becauſe it too plainly ſpoke the Doctrine of the* Proteſtants *as to this point. And the ſame has almoſt happened to this* Treatiſe *of* Monſieur de Marca *here mentioned*: † *Before it came to a publick ſight, the paſſages that ſeemed moſt viſibly to oppoſe*

* Defence of the Expoſition of the Doctrine of the *Church of Engl. Appendix, p.* 127. *n.* v.

† See the Preface to the Reader before the Edition of the ſame Treatiſes 12° *Anno* 1669. and *Monſieur Baluze*'s Letter to the [Biſhop of *Tulle* on this occaſion. *p.* 5.

poſe

poſe their Doctrine, were either changed *or* ſuppreſs'd ; * *(of which the paſſage before cited is one) as appears by the* Paris Edition *now extant of them. But* † *the Providence of God that brought to light the other, has diſcover'd this cheat too ; For before the alarm was given and that the* Chancellor, (*a*) *the* Sorbonne Doctors, *but eſpecially monſieur* Baluze *by his Letters to the* Preſident de Marca, *the* Archbiſhop's Son, *upon this occaſion, had awakened the Abbé* Faget *to conſider more nearly what he had done ;* (*b*) *ſeveral Preſents had been made of the intire work as it was in the Authors MS. ; and, if we may credit their own relations, the* Printer *who was a* Proteſtant *and the ſame that printed* (*c*) *Monſieur* Claude's *Books againſt the* Perpetuité, *had obliged that learned Perſon with a Copy ; by which means both the genuine ſentiments of Monſieur* de Marca *in oppoſition to* Tranſubſtantiation *are preſerved, and their fraudulent endeavours to ſuppreſs his opinion diſcovered.*

* The *Original leaves* cut out by them having fallen into my Hands, may be ſeen by thoſe that deſire it in S. *Martin's Library.*

† See *Monſieur Baluze* 2. *Lettre pag.* 15.

(*a*) *Mais enfin le refus que Mrs. de Sorbonne luy ont fait de luy donner leur approbation------ luy ont fait ouvrir les yeux, s'eſtant laiſſé entendre, quoyqu'un peu tard, qu'il a fait une Sottiſe.* ibid.

(*b*) *Et p.* 16. *Je dis, un peu tard ; parce qu'il avoit deja fait des preſentes de ſon livre, & que le libraire en avoit auſſi debité quelques uns.*

(*c*) *Baluze Lettre à Monſieur l'Eveſque de Tulle,* p. 5.

To this eminent Perſon *I will beg leave to ſubjoyn a* fifth, *and he too no leſs known to the World both for his Learning and Reputation, nor leſs a* Heretick *in this point, however not hitherto ſo openly diſcovered as the other: and that is Father* Sirmond *the* Jeſuit. *In his life of* Paſchaſius Radbertus, *he tells us,* 'That this Monk was the firſt 'who explained the genuine ſenſe of the Catho-'lick Church in this myſtery: *and indeed if what* * Blondel *and ſome others have obſerved concerning him be true, that it was for* Impanation, *not* Tranſub-

Sirmond. Vit. Paſch. Radbert.

* *Eclairciſſement de l'Euch. c.* 19. *p.* 431, &c.

ſubſtantiation; *the* Jeſuit *perhaps ſpoke his real judgment of him, though not in that ſenſe that he is uſually underſtood to have done it.*

But however that be, certain it is that this learned Father *ſo little believed the Doctrine of the preſent* Roman Church *as to this* point, *that he freely confeſs'd he thought it had herein departed from the antient Faith; and at the deſire of one of his Friends wrote a ſhort* Treatiſe *to confirm his Aſſertion. This though it be not yet made publick, is nevertheleſs in the hands of ſeveral Perſons of undoubted integrity: I will mention only one, whoſe learning and worth are ſufficiently known to the World,* viz. Monſieur Bigot: *who diſcourſing with Father* Raynauld *at* Lyons *about this matter, the* Jeſuit *confeſs'd to him that it was true, that he had himſelf a copy of his* Treatiſe *which he would communicate to him, and that it was Father* Sirmond *whom upon this account he reflected upon in his Book,* de bonis & malis Libris, *where he obſerves,* 'That Men of great parts love to innovate, and invent always ſomewhat of their own 'in difficult matters.

Ingenia præclara in rebus difficilibus aliquid ſemper de ſuo comminiſcuntur. Nam præclara ingenia multa novant circa ſcientias. Theoph. Raynaudi S. J. Erotemata de malis ac bonis libris: Lugduni 1653. *p.* 251.

When Monſieur Bigot *return'd to claim the performance of his promiſe, the* Jeſuit *excuſed himſelf to him that he could not light upon it; which when he afterwards told to Father* Chiflet *another* Jeſuit *of* Dijonois, *he again confirmed to him the truth of the relation, and voluntarily offer'd him a* Copy *of the* Treatiſe, *which he told to him was tranſcribed from Father* Sirmonds *Original. This Monſieur*

ſieur Bigot *has not only acknowledged to ſome of his Friends of my acquaintance, but promiſed to communicate to them the very* Treatiſe; *and I dare appeal to the candor of that worthy Perſon for the truth of what I have here related, and whoſe name I ſhould not have mentioned, but only to remove all reaſonable cauſe of ſuſpicion in a matter of ſuch importance.*

And what I have now ſaid of Father Sirmond, *I might as truly affirm of a ſixth* Perſon *of as great a name, a* Doctor *of the* Sorbonne, *whoſe Treatiſe againſt* Tranſubſtantiation *has been ſeen by ſeveral perſons, and is ſtill read in the MS. But becauſe I am not at liberty to make uſe of their names, I ſhall not any further inſiſt upon this example.*

My next inſtance will be more undeniable, and it is of the ingenious Monſieur de Marolles *Abbot of* Ville-loyn, *well known in* France *for his excellent Writings and great Abilities. A little before his death, which happen'd about the beginning of the Year* 1681. *being deſirous to free his Conſcience as to the point of the Holy* Euchariſt, *in which he ſuppoſed their Church to have many ways departed from the right Faith, he cauſed a* Paper *to be* Printed, *in which he declares his thoughts concerning it; and ſent it to ſeveral of his moſt learned Acquaintance, the better to undeceive them in this matter. One of theſe Perſons, to whom this Preſent was made, having been pleaſed to communicate to me the very* Paper *which by the* Abbot's *order was brought to him, it may not perhaps be amiſs to gratifie the* Reader's *curioſity, if I here inſert it at its full length.*

* *Permiſſion*

* *Permiſſion hoped for to ſpeak freely for the Truth.*

* The Abbot means, that now at his death he hoped he might ſpeak freely what he durſt not in his Life-time do.

'I Cannot but exceedingly wonder that a certain Preacher, who reads the *Holy Scriptures*, 'and will maintain nothing but by their Autho-'rity, ſhould nevertheleſs undertake to defend a-'gainſt all Oppoſers by the Scriptures, the *Real* '*Preſence* in the *Euchariſt* out of the act of re-'ceiving; and think himſelf ſo ſure to overcome 'on this Occaſion, as to talk of it as a thing cer-'tain, and in which he knows he cannot be re-'ſiſted.

'It would certainly be more ſafe not to be too much 'prepoſſeſſed with any thing. I will not name the 'Perſon, becauſe I have no mind to diſpleaſe him; 'But in the mean time, neither *Senſe*, nor *Rea-'ſon*, nor *the Word of God* have ſuggeſted to him 'one word of it; unleſs the Apoſtle was miſtaken 'when he ſaid, '*If ye are riſen with Chriſt, ſeek* '*thoſe things that are above, where Chriſt is ſate* '*at the right hand of God. Set your affection on things* '*above, and not on things upon the Earth.* Coloſſ. 3. '1, 2. For how could he ſpeak after this manner, 'if JESUS CHRIST be ſtill upon *Earth* by his *Real* '*Preſence* under the *ſpecies* in the *Euchariſt*?

'When he aſcended into Heaven, he ſaid not 'to his Diſciples which ſaw his wonderful Aſcen-'ſion;

'ſion; *I ſhall be with you always by my* Real Preſence '*under the* ſpecies *of the* Euchariſt, *which ſhall be pub-* 'lickly *expoſed to you.* In his Sermon at the Sup- 'per which he had juſt now celebrated, and which 'immediately preceded his *Paſſion*, JESUS CHRIST 'according to S. *John* ſays expreſly to his Apoſtles, 'that he was about to leave them, that he ſhould 'not be long abſent, that he would ſend to them 'the *Comforter*: but not one word of his *Real* '*Preſence in the Euchariſt*, which he had ſo late- 'ly inſtituted under the *Bread* and *Wine*, to be 'a Myſtery of our Faith for the nouriſhment 'of the *Soul* to *life Eternal*, as ordinary *Bread* 'and *Wine* are for the nouriſhment of the *Body* to 'a *temporal Life*; and that too for ALL the faithful, 'as is clearly ſignified by thoſe Words, *Drink ye* '*all of this.* Whereupon I have elſewhere remark'd 'the cuſtom of *Libations* which were in uſe time 'out of mind throughout the whole *Roman* Em- 'pire, and which cuſtom was eſtabliſh'd in ho- 'nour of the gods: As may be ſeen in the Verſion 'of *Athenæus* in 1680; and as I had obſerved long 'before upon *Virgil* and *Horace*, though there was 'but little notice taken of it. Which makes me 'think it very probable, that our Saviour intend- 'ed to ſanctifie this Profane cuſtom, as he did 'ſome others, which I have remarked in the ſame 'place.

'When Men undertake to prove too much, they 'very often prove nothing at all: To maintain 'that JESUS CHRIST is intire in the *Euchariſt* with 'all his Bodily extenſion, and all his Dignity, ſo 'as he is in Heaven; ſo that under the *Roundneſs* 'of the *Bread* there is nothing that is *Round*;

'under

'under the *Whiteneſs* there is nothing *White*; this 'is what the Scripture has not ſaid one word of. 'They are indeed meer *Viſions*, and which are not 'ſo eaſie to maintain as Men may think. The 'Prieſt who celebrates breaks the *Hoſt* in three 'pieces; One of theſe he puts into the Cup, of 'the two others he communicates, in memory as 'tis plain of what we read, That *Jeſus the night 'in which he was betray'd took Bread, and when 'he had given thanks, he brake it, and ſaid, Take, 'Eat, This is my Body which is broken for you, Do 'this in remembrance of me.* 1 Cor. 11. 23, 24. In the '*Maſs* there is here no more *Bread*, they are only 'the *appearances of Bread*, that is to ſay, the *Ac-'cidents*, and which are not tied to any *Subſtance.* 'And yet ſo long as there is but one *Atom* of 'thoſe *Accidents* which they call *Euchariſtical ſpecies* 'in the *Conſecration* that has been made, the *true 'Fleſh* of the Lord JESUS is ſo annex'd to them, 'that it remains there whole and intire without 'the leaſt confuſion, and may be ſo in diverſe places 'at the ſame time. I doubt not but thoſe who 'teach us this Doctrine have thought of it more 'than once; but have they well conſider'd it? for 'there is not one word of it in all the *Sacred 'Writings.*

'Is it nothing that JESUS CHRIST ſaid to his A-'poſtles but a little while before his *Paſſion*, when 'he was now about to celebrate his Holy Supper 'with them, *You ſhall have the Poor always with 'you, but me ye ſhall not have always, Matth.* 26. '11. His *Real Preſence in the Euchariſt*, out of the 'act of communicating, not excepted?

'They

'They ſay to the People, *Behold your Creator* '*that made Heaven and Earth*: And the People ſee- 'ing the conſecrated Bread in the *Ciboire* wherein 'tis 'carry'd abroad, ſays, *Behold the* GOOD GOD *going* '*in proceſſion to confound the Hereticks:* and ac- 'cording to their natural inclination, they a- 'dore with all their Hearts they know not what, 'becauſe ſo they have been inſtructed; and the 'better to maintain their prejudice intire in this 'matter, they become mad: But alas! they know not 'what they do, and we ought to pity their 'Exceſs.

'On the other ſide, who can tell whether the 'Prieſt has *conſecrated*, or indeed whether he be 'capable of *conſecrating*? It is a point of Faith 'to believe, that among ſo many Prieſts, not one 'of them is a *Cheat* and an *Impoſtor*? This cer- 'tainly cannot be of Faith; and if this be not, 'neither is that which expoſed with ſo much Pomp, 'to carry the *true Body* of the *Lord* through the 'Streets, of Faith. Thus the belief is at beſt but '*Conjecture*; and then *whatſoever* in ſuch caſes *is* '*not of Faith, is ſin*, according to the Apoſtle, '*Rom.* 14. 23.

'I know not what colour can be ſufficient to 'excuſe ſo ſtrong an Objection, unleſs Men will 'abſolutely reſiſt the *Holy Scripture*, and *right* '*Reaſon* founded upon it.

''Tis further ſaid, that JESUS CHRIST is in ma- 'ny places at the ſame time, in the *Hoſts* which 'are carried in very different manners; But neither 'for this is there any Text of *Scripture*. You will 'ſay, this may be; I anſwer, the Queſtion here 'is not of the Infinite power of JESUS CHRIST, but

'of his Will, and which we muſt obey when it is 'known to us; and of this as to the preſent point 'we read nothing in the *Holy Scripture*. The 'ſhorter way then would be to ſay, that the *Sa-* 'crament of one Pariſh is not the ſame with that 'of another, although both the one and the other 'concur in the ſame deſign to worſhip God; as 'the *Paſchal Lamb* of one Family, was not the '*Lamb* of another, although both the one and the 'other were to accompliſh the ſame Myſtery. 'Thus for inſtance, on *Corpus Chriſti-day*, the *Sa-* 'crament of S. *Germain d' Auxerrois*, where the 'perpetual Vicar conſecrates the Hoſt, and *Monſieur* 'the Dean the firſt *Curé*, carrys it the Proceſſion 'under a rich Canopy crown'd with Flowers, this 'Hoſt is not the ſame with that of S. *Paul*'s which 'is carried after another manner, *viz.* the Image 'of that Apoſtle made of Silver gilt, falling from 'his Horſe at his Converſion, under the *Sacra-* 'ment of JESUS CHRIST hung up in rays of Gold, 'and carried under the covering of another ſtate- 'ly Canopy; and ſo of all the other Churches.

'As for the ſtories of ſeveral *Hoſts* that have 'been *ſtabb'd* with *Penknives*, and have *bled*, they 'ſerve only to bring in ſome ſuperſtition contrary 'to the word of God, which never pretended that 'there was material *Blood* in the conſecrated 'Bread, becauſe it is the *Body* of JESUS CHRIST in 'a *myſtery of Faith*.

'For what is ſaid of an *Infant* that was ſeen in 'the ſtead of the *Hoſt*, and of the figure of Chriſt 'ſitting upon a *Sepulchre* inſtead of the ſame 'Hoſt, are meer *Fables* ſuggeſted by the *Father* 'of *Lies*.

'It

'It is further reported of certain Robbers, that 'carrying away the Veſſel in which the *Hoſt* is 'kept, they have thrown the *Hoſt* it ſelf upon 'the ground, and trampled it under foot, ſome-'times have caſt it into naſty places, without any 'fear that it ſhould avenge it ſelf; This is a moſt 'horrible thought, and of which we ought not to 'open our mouths, but only to deteſt ſo dreadful 'a profanation.

'The ſame muſt be ſaid of thoſe *Hoſts* which 'have been caſt up, as ſoon as received, whether 'by ſick perſons, or ſometimes by debauched Prieſts, 'diſordered with the laſt nights intemperance; both 'which have ſometimes happened, not to ſay any 'thing of thoſe other terrible inconveniences, re-'mark'd in the Cautions concerning the *Maſs*. All 'which ſhew that Men have carry'd things too 'far, without any warrant from the Word of 'God.

'It is not therefore ſo eaſie, as ſome imagine, 'to maintain the Doctrine of the *Real Preſence* 'out of the Uſe, againſt the Opinions of any Op-'poſer.

'In the mean time the Truth is terribly obſcured, 'and few give themſelves the trouble to clear it. 'On the contrary it ſeems that among the many 'Writers of the Age, there are ſome who make it 'their whole buſineſs to hide it, and to keep them-'ſelves from finding it out, as if they deſired never to 'be wiſer than they are. The vanity of lying flat-'ters them but too much in all the Humane paſſions 'which ſway them.

'There are nevertheleſs ſome faithful Diſciples, 'and Apoſtolick Souls who are exempted, to obey

'God by his Grace, and to give glory to his Name. 'It was not long before his departure that *David* 'ſaid, *Every man is a lyar*: Pſal. 115. 2. and S. *Paul* 'to the *Romans* 3. 4. to ſhow that God only is true, * Li. 4. 'adds immediately after from *Pſalm* * 50. 6. That '*Thou mighteſt be juſtified when thou ſpeakeſt, and be* 'clear when thou judgeſt.

Such was the Opinion of Monſieur de Marolles *as to this* point: *I ſhould too much treſpaſs upon the Reader's patience to inſiſt thus particularly upon others of leſſer note. The Author of the late* Hiſtorical Treatiſe of Tranſubſtantiation, *has fully ſhewn not only his* own Opinion, *but the* Tradition *of all the* Ages *of the* Church *againſt it:* * The ſame had before been attempted by another Author of the *Entretiens de Philalethe & de Philirene*; *And though I dare not ſay the ſame of whoever he was that ſet forth the* † Moyens ſurs & Honneſtes, *&c. that he did not believe* Tranſubſtantiation *himſelf, yet this is clear,* 'That he did not deſire any one ſhould be 'forced to believe it; or indeed be encouraged 'to ſearch too nicely into the *manner how Chriſt is* 'Preſent and Eaten *in the Holy Sacrament.*

* *See* 2d. *part, Entretien.* vii. *p.* 243 244. *Cologne* 1684.

† *Il nous ſuffit que J. C. qui eſt la Verité même, nous ait aſſuré que ce Sacrement eſt veritablement ſon Corps, & qu'il ait ordonné de manger ſa chair & boire ſon ſang: car il faut abſolument qu'il y ſoit, puis qu'il il nous ordonne de l'y manger, ſans s'embarraſſer l'Eſprit de quelle maniere & comment cela ſe fait* 2. Part, p. 102.

Whether Monſieur de Meaux *believes this Doctrine or not, his authority is become of ſo little importance, that I do not think it worth the while to examine. Yet the firſt* French * Anſwer *to his* Expoſition *obſerves, that in the* ſuppreſs'd Edition *of*

* Advertiſſement *n.* 14. *p.* 22. Mr. B.— ſpeaking of that Edition, *Il n'y avoit en aucun lieu de l'Article, ni le terme de Tranſubſtantiation, ni cette propoſition, que* 'le pain & le vin ſont changez au corps & au ſang de J. C. dans 'la derniere [*Edition*] après ces mots, le propre Corps & le propre Sang de J. C. il a 'ajouté auſquels le pain & le vin ſont changez; c'eſt ce qu'on appelle *Tranſubſtantiation.*

it

it he had not at all mentioned ‘ *that the* Bread and ‘ *Wine* are *turned* into the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*; *thoſe words in the cloſe of that Paragraph which we now read*, viz. ‘ that the Bread and the Wine are ‘ changed into the proper Body, and proper ‘ Blood of Jeſus Chriſt, and that this is that which ‘ is called Tranſubſtantiation, *being put in*, perhaps, † for the greater neatneſs of the Diſcourſe and Stile, *ſince*.

† *Monſieur de Meaux* Letter of his alterations; *Vind. p.* 13. & 117. *pour l'ordre, & pour une plus grande netteté du diſcours & du ſtyle.*

But now for his Vindicator, *'tis evident, if he underſtands his own meaning, that he is not very well inſtructed about it.* * ‘ It is manifeſt, *ſays he*, that ‘ our diſpute with Proteſtants is not about the ‘ MANNER, *How Jeſus Chriſt is Preſent*, but only a- ‘ bout the THING it ſelf, whether the *Body* and *Blood* ‘ of JESUS CHRIST be *truly*, *really*, and *ſubſtan- ‘ tially preſent* after the words of *Conſecration*, ‘ under the *ſpecies* or *Appearance* of *Bread* and ‘ *Wine*, the *ſubſtance* of *Bread* and *Wine* being not ‘ ſo *preſent*.

* Vindication of the Biſhop of *Condom's* Expoſ. *Pag.* 83.

In which words, if his meaning be to exclude totally the ‘ MANNER, How Jeſus Chriſt becomes pre- ‘ ſent in the Euchariſt, *as his expreſſion is, from being a matter of Faith, it might well have been ranged amongſt the reſt of their* NEW POPERY 1686. *But if he deſigns not to exclude the* MANNER *of* Chriſt's Preſence, *but only the* MODE *of the* Converſion, *as he ſeems by ſome other of his words to inſinuate*, viz. *whether it be by* Adduction, *&c. from being a matter of Faith, he ought not then to have deny'd the* manner of Chriſt's Preſence in the Euchariſt, *which their Church has abſolutely defined to be* by that wonderful and ſingular Converſion ſo aptly called Tranſubſtantiation; *but more preciſely to have explain'd his* School-

nicety,

nicety, *and which is altogether as* unintelligible, *as the* Myſtery *which 'tis brought to* explain.

I might to the particulars hitherto mentioned, add the whole Sect of their new Philoſophers, *who following the* Hypotheſis *of their Maſter* Des-Cartes, *that* Accidents *are nothing elſe but the* Modes *of* Matter, *muſt here either renounce his Doctrine or their Churches Belief. But I ſhall cloſe theſe remarks, which have already run to a greater length than I deſigned, with one inſtance more, from a* Prelate *of our own* Church, *but yet whoſe truly Chriſtian ſincerity will I am perſwaded juſtifie him even to thoſe of the* Roman Communion: *and it is the learned Archbiſhop* Uſher, *who having been ſo happy as to convert ſeveral* Roman Prieſts *from their errors, and inquiring diligently of them, what they who ſaid* Maſs *every day, and were not obliged to confeſs* Venial Sins, *could have to trouble their* Confeſſors *ſo continually withal; ingenuouſly acknowledged to him, that the chiefeſt part of their conſtant* Confeſſion *was their* Infidelity *as to the point of* Tranſubſtantiation, *and for which as was moſt fit, they mutually* quitted and abſolved one another.

The ſame is affirmed by *Monſieur du Moulin* of ſeveral Prieſts in *France*: *Diſp. Sedanenſ. de Sacr. Euch. par.* 4. *p.* 846. *Nec abs re de intentione preſbyteri dubitatur, cum plurimi Sacerdotes canant Miſſam reluctante Conſcientiâ, quales multos vidimus qui ejurato Papiſmo fatebantur ſe diu ceciniſſe Miſſam animo à Miſſâ alienisſimo.*

And now that is thus clear from ſo many inſtances of the greateſt Men in the Roman Church, *which this laſt Age has produced; and from whoſe diſcovery we may reaſonably enough infer the like of many others that have not come to our knowledge, that ſeveral Perſons who have lived and enjoyed ſome of the greateſt* Honours *and* Dignities *in that* Communion, *have nevertheleſs been* Hereticks *in this*

this point; may I beſeech thoſe who are ſtill miſ-led with this great Error, to ſtop a while, and ſeriouſly examine with me two or three plain conſiderations, and in which I ſuppoſe they are not a little concerned.

And the firſt is, Of their own danger: *but eſpecially upon their* Own Principles.

It is but a very little while ſince an ingenious Perſon now living in the French Church, *the* Abbé Petit *publiſh'd a Book which he* 'calls (a) The truths of the 'Chriſtian Religion proved and 'defended againſt the antient Here-'ſies by the Truth of the Eucha-'riſt: *And what he means by this* 'truth, *he thus declares in his* Preface, 'viz. the change of (b) the Bread 'into the Body of the Son of God, 'and of the Wine into his Blood. 'He there pretends that this Do-'ctrine, however combatted by us 'now, was (c) yet more undoubt-'ed in the Primitive Church than 'either the divinity of Chriſt and 'the Holy Ghoſt, or the certainty 'of our future Reſurrection. *And* 'this he wrote as the Title tells us, '(d) To confirm the new Converts 'in the Faith of the Catholick Church; *meaning, according to their uſual figure, the* Roman. *How far this extravagant undertaking may ſerve to* convince *them I cannot tell; this I know, that if* we

(a) *Les Veritez de la Religion prouvées & defendues contre les anciennes Hereſies, par la verité de l'Euchariſtie.* 1686.

(b) *Que du pain divienne le Corps du fils de Dieu, & du Vin ſon ſang. Preface* p. 7.

(c) *Quoiqu'il n'y ait point, preſentement de verites plus inconteſtables que les trois grands articles de noſtre foi, qui ſont contenus dans le ſymbole, c'eſt à dire, la divinité de J. C. la divinité du S. Eſprit, & la Reſurrection: Cependant j'oſe dire que la preſence réelle de J. C. au Saint Sacrament etoit une verité encore plus indubitable dans les premiers ſiecles de l'Egliſe. Pref.* p. 5.

(d) *Traitté pour confirmer les Nouveaux Convertis dans la foi de l'Egliſe Catholique.*

we *may credit thoſe who have been that* Abbot's *moſt intimate acquaintance, he believes but very little of it himſelf, unleſs he alſo be become as to this point,* a new Convert.

But now if what has before been ſaid of ſo many eminent Perſons *of their* Church *be true, as after a due and diligent examination of every particular there ſet down, I muſt beg leave to profeſs I am fully perſwaded that it is; 'twill need no long deduction to ſhew how dangerous an influence their unbelief muſt have had, in ſome of the chiefeſt inſtances of their conſtant* Worſhip.

(e) *Concil. Trid. Seſſ.* vii. *Can.* 11. *ſiquis dixerit in miniſtris dum Sacramenta conficiunt, non requiri intentionem, ſaltem faciendi quod facit Eccleſia, Anathema ſit.*

(f) *Vid. de defectibus circa Miſſam, c. de defectu Intentionis. In Miſſali R.*

For 1. *It is the Doctrine of the* (e) Council *of* Trent, *that to make a* Sacrament, *the Prieſt muſt have, if not an* Actual, *yet at leaſt a* Virtual Intention of doing that which the Church does: *And in the* (f) Rubricks *of their* Miſſal, *the want of ſuch an* Intention *in the* Prieſt *is one of the* defects *there ſet down as ſufficient to* hinder a Conſecration. *Now if this be true, as every* Roman Catholick *who acknowledges the Authority of that* Synod *muſt believe it to be; 'tis then evident that in all thoſe* Maſſes *which any of the Perſons I before named have ſaid, there could have been no* Conſecration: *It being abſurd to ſuppoſe that they who believed not* Tranſubſtantiation, *could have an* intention *to make any ſuch* change *of the* Bread *into the* Body *of Chriſt, which they thought it impoſſible to do.*

Now if there were no Conſecration, *but that the* Bread *continued* meer Bread *as it was before; then Secondly, All thoſe who attended at their* Maſſes, *and* Adored *their* Hoſts, *pay'd the* ſupream worſhip of God *to a bare* Wafer, *and no more. How far the modern*

modern plea of their good Intention *to* Adore Chriſt *in thoſe ſacred Offices, may excuſe them from having committed* Idolatry, *it is not neceſſary I ſhould here examine. They who deſire a ſatisfaction in this matter, may pleaſe to recur to a late excellent* Treatiſe *written purpoſely on this Subject, and where they will find the weakneſs of this ſuppoſal ſufficiently expoſed. But ſince* (a) *many of their own greateſt Men confeſs that if any one by* miſtake *ſhould worſhip an* Unconſecrated Hoſt, *taking it to have been* Conſecrated, *he would be guilty of* Idolatry; *and that ſuch an* Error *would not be ſufficient to* excuſe *him; may they pleaſe to conſider with what* Faith *they can pay this* Divine Adoration *to that which all their* Senſes *tell them is but a bit of* Bread; *to the hinderance of whoſe Converſion ſo many things may interpoſe, that were their Doctrine otherwiſe as* infallible, *as we are certain it is* falſe, *it would yet be a hundred to one that there is no* Conſecration: *in a word; how they can worſhip that which they can never be ſecure is* changed *into* Chriſt's Body, *nay when, as the examples I have before given ſhew, they have all the reaſon in the World to fear, whether even the* Prieſt *himſelf who ſays the* Maſs *does indeed believe that he has any Power, or by conſequence can have any* intention, *to turn it into the* Fleſh of Chriſt.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Adoration of the Hoſt. *Lond.* 1685.

(a) *Vid. Cathavin. in Cajet. pag.* 133. *Ed. Paris.* 1535. Where he quotes S. *Thomas* and *Paludanus* for the ſame Opinion: This Book of his was ſeen and approved by the Pope's order by the Divines at *Paris*: as himſelf tells us in the review of it. *Lugdun.* 1542.

And the ſame conſideration will ſhew, Thirdly; How little ſecurity their other Plea of Concomitance, *which they ſo much inſiſt upon, to ſhew the ſufficiency of their* Communicating only in one kind, *viz.* 'that they receive the Blood *in the* 'Body, *can give to the* Laity, *to ſatisfie their*

Conſciences that they ever partake of that Bleſſed Sacrament as they ought to do. Since whatever is pretended of Chriſt's Body, *'tis certain there can be none of his* Blood *in a meer* Wafer: *And if by reaſon of the* Prieſt's infidelity, *the* Hoſt *ſhould be indeed nothing elſe, of which we have ſhewn they can never be ſure; neither can they ever know whether what they receive be upon their own Principles, and* intire Communion.

And then Laſtly, for the main thing of all, The Sacrifice of the Maſs; *it is clear that if* Chriſt's Body *be not* truly *and* properly *there, it cannot be* truly *and* properly offer'd; *nor any of thoſe great benefits be derived to them from a* morſel of Bread, *which themſelves declare can proceed only from the* Fleſh *and* Blood of *their Bleſſed Lord.*

It is I know an eaſie matter for thoſe who can believe Tranſubſtantiation, *to believe alſo that there is no hazard in all theſe great and apparent dangers. But yet in matters of ſuch moment Men ought to deſire to be well aſſured, and not expoſed even to any poſſible defects. I do not now inſiſt upon the common remarks, which yet are* Authorized *by their own* Miſſal, *and may give juſt grounds to their fears*; 'That 'if the Wafer be not made of 'Wheat, but of ſome other Corn, 'there is then no Conſecration: 'If it be mixed not with com-'mon, but diſtill'd Water, it is 'doubtful whether it be Conſe-'crated. If the Wine be ſowre 'to ſuch a certain degree, that then it becomes 'incapable

De defectibus circa Miſſam: De defectu panis. *Si panis non ſit triticeus, vel ſi triticeus, ſit admixtus granis alterius generis in tantâ quantitate, ut non maneat panis triticeus, vel ſit alioqui corruptus: non conficitur Sacramentum. Si ſit confectus de aquâ roſaceâ vel alterius diſtillationis, dubium eſt an conficiatur?* Et de defect. vini. *Si Vinum ſit factum penitus acetum, vel penitus putridum, vel de uvis acerbis ſeu non maturis expreſſum, vel admixtum tantum aquæ ut vinum ſit corruptum, non conficitur Sacramentum.*

'incapable of being changed into the Blood of 'Chriſt; *with many more of the like kind, and which render it always uncertain to them, whether there be any* change *made in the bleſſed* Elements *or no*; * *the Relations I have given, are not of counterfeit* Jews *and* Moors, *who to eſcape the danger of the* Inquiſition *have ſometimes become* Prieſts, *and adminiſtred all the Sacraments for many years together, without ever having an intention to Adminiſter* truly *any one of them, and of which I could give an eminent inſtance in a certain* Jew *now living; who for many Years was not only a* Prieſt, *but a* Profeſſor of Divinity *in* Spain, *and all the while in reality a meer* Jew, *as he is ſtill. The* Perſons *here mention'd were Men of undoubted reputation, of great learning and ſingular eſteem in their* Church; *and if theſe found the impoſſibilities of* Tranſubſtantiation *ſo much greater than either the pretended* Authority *or* Infallibility *of their* Church; *certainly they may have juſt cauſe to fear, whether many others of their* Prieſts *do not* Live *in the ſame infidelity in which theſe have* Died, *and ſo expoſe them to all the hazards now mentioned, and which are undeniably the conſequences of ſuch their* Unbelief.

* *Du Moulin*, in the place above cited, mentions one that in his time was burnt at *London* for Conſecrating a Hoſt in the name of the Devil. *Theſ. Sedann. Th.* 97. *n.* 10. *p.* 846. *Vol.* 1.

But theſe are not the only dangers *I would deſire thoſe of that* Communion *to reflect on upon this occaſion. Another there is, and of greater conſequence than any I have hitherto mentioned, and which may perhaps extend not only to this* Holy Euchariſt, *but it may be to the invalidating of moſt of their other* Sacraments. † *It is the Doctrine of the*

† *Eugenii* IV. *decret. in Act. Concil. Florent. Ann.* 1439. *Concil. Labb. Tom.* 13. *p.* 535. *Concil. Trident. Seſſ.* VII. *Can.* 2.

Roman Church *that to the* Validity *of every* Sacrament, *and therefore of that of* Orders *as well as the reſt three things muſt concur*, 'a due *matter*, a 'right *form*, and the *Perſon* of *the Miniſter con-* 'ferring *the* Sacrament, *with an* intention *of doing* 'what *the* Church *does*. *Where either of theſe is wanting*, *the* Sacrament *is not performed*. *If therefore the* Biſhop *in conferring the Holy Order of* Prieſthood *has not an* intention of doing what the Church does, *'tis plain that the Perſon to be ordained receives no* Prieſtly Character *of him*; *nor by conſequence has any power of* conſecrating *the Holy* Euchariſt, *or of being hereafter advanced to a* higher degree. *Now the* form *of conferring the* Order *of* Prieſthood *they determine to be this*; † The Biſhop delivers the Cup with ſome Wine, and the Paten with Bread into the Hands of the perſon whom he Ordains, ſaying, 'Receive *the* 'Power *of* offering a Sacrifice *in the Church for the* 'living *and the* dead, *in the name of the* Father, 'and *of the* Son, *and of the* Holy Ghoſt. *By* 'which Ceremony *and* words, their *Catechiſm* tells 'us, *He is conſtituted an Interpreter and Mediator* 'between *God and Man*; *which is to be eſteemed* 'the *chiefeſt Function of a Prieſt*. *So that then the* intention *neceſſary to the conferring the* Order *of* Prieſthood *is this*; *to give a Power to* conſecrate, *i.e. to* Tranſubſtantiate *the* Hoſt *into Chriſt's* Body, *and ſo* offer *it as a* Sacrifice *for the* Living *and the* Dead.

† *Ibid. pag.* 538. *Catech. Concil. Trid. de Sacr. Ord. n.* xxii. *p.* 222. *Item, n.* L. *p.* 228.

If therefore any of their Biſhops, for inſtance, Cardinal du Perron, *or* Monſieur de Marca, *did not believe that either the* Church *or* themſelves *as Biſhops of it, had any* Authority *to confer any ſuch* Power,

Power, *they could not certainly have any* Intention of doing *in this caſe* what the Church *intends to* do. *Having no ſuch* Intention, *the Perſons whom they pretended to* Ordain *were no* Prieſts. *Being no* Prieſts *they had no* Power to Conſecrate. *All the* Hoſts *therefore which were either* offered *or* taken, *or* worſhipped *in any of the* Maſſes *celebrated by thoſe* Prieſts *whom theſe two* Biſhops Ordained, *were only* meer Bread, *and not the* Body of Chriſt; *And as many of them, as being afterwards advanced to a higher dignity, were conſecrated* Biſhops, *received no* Epiſcopal Character, *becauſe they were deſtitute of the* Prieſtly *before. Thus the danger ſtill encreaſes: For by this means, the* Prieſts *whom they alſo* Ordain *are no* Prieſts; *and when any of them ſhall be promoted to a higher degree, are uncapable of being made* Biſhops; *And ſo by the Infidelity of theſe two Men, there are at this day infinite numbers of* Prieſts *and* Biſhops, *who* ſay Maſs, *and confer* Orders *without any manner of power to do either; and in a little time it may be there ſhall not be a true* Biſhop *or* Prieſt *in the whole* Gallicane Church. *But*

II. *A ſecond* Conſideration *which I would beg leave to offer from the fore-going inſtances is this: What reliance we can make upon the* Pretended Infallibility *of their* Church; *when 'tis thus plain that ſo many of the moſt learned Men of their own* Communion *did not only not believe it to be* Infallible, *but ſuppoſed it to have* actually Erred, *and that in thoſe very Doctrines that are at this day eſteemed the moſt conſiderable* Points *in difference between Us.*

It

It is plain from what has been ſaid in the foregoing reflection, *that disbelieving* Tranſubſtantiation, *they muſt alſo have lookt upon all the other Conſequences of it*, viz. *the* Adoration of the Hoſt, *the* Sacrifice of the Maſs, *&c. as Erroneous too. Now though it be not yet agreed among them, nor ever likely to be, where the* ſuppoſed Infallibility *of their* Church *is ſeated, yet ſince all manner of Authority has conſpired to eſtabliſh theſe things*; Popes *have* decreed *them*, Councils defined *them, and both* Popes *and* Councils anathematized *all thoſe that ſhall preſume to doubt of them*; *'tis evident either theſe Men did not believe the* Church *to be* Infallible, *as is pretended*; *or they did not believe the* Roman *to be, according to the modern phraſe, indeed the* Catholick Church.

III. *And upon the ſame grounds there will ariſe a third* Reflection, *which they may pleaſe to make with us*; *and that is, with what Reaſon they can preſs us with the* Authority *of their* Church *in theſe matters*; *when ſuch eminent Perſons of their own* Communion, *and who certainly were much more Obliged to it than we can be thought to be, yet did not eſteem it ſufficient to enſlave their belief.*

It is a reproach generally caſt upon us, that we ſet up a private Spirit *in oppoſition to the* Wiſdom *and* Authority *of the* Church *of God: and think our ſelves better able to* judge *in matters of* Faith, *than the moſt* General Council *that was ever yet aſſembled. This is uſually ſaid, but is indeed a foul* Miſrepreſentation *of our Opinion. All we ſay is, that every Man ought to* act Rationally *in matters of* Religion, *as well as in* other *concerns*; *to employ*

ploy his Underſtanding with the utmoſt skill and diligence that he is able, to know God's will, and what it is that he requires of us. We do not ſet up our own judgments *againſt the* Authority of the Church: *but having both the Holy* Oracles *of* God, *and the* Definitions of Men *before us, we give to each their proper weight. And therefore if the* one *at any time contradicts the* other, *we reſolve, as is moſt fitting, not that* our own, *but* God's Authority *revealed to us in his* Word, *is to be preferred. And he who without this* examination *ſervilely gives up himſelf to follow whatever is required of him; He may be in the right, if his* Church *or* Guide *be ſo; but according to this method, ſhall never be able to give a* reaſon *of his* Faith; *nor if he chance to be born in a* Falſe Religion, *ever be in a capacity of being better inſtructed. For if we muſt be allowed nothing but to obey only, and not preſume to* enquire *why; He that is a* Jew *muſt continue a* Jew *ſtill; he that is a* Turk, *a* Turk; *a* Proteſtant *muſt alway be a* Proteſtant: *In ſhort, in whatſoever* profeſſion *any one now is, in that he muſt continue, whether* true *or* falſe, *if* reaſon *and* examination *muſt be excluded all place in* matters *of* Religion.

* *And indeed after all their clamours againſt us on this occaſion, yet is this no more than what themſelves require of us when 'tis in order to their own advantage. Is a* Proſelyte *to be made? they offer to him their Arguments: They tell him a long ſtory of their* Church; *the* Succeſſion, Viſibility, *and other Notes of it. To what purpoſe is all this, if we are not to be* Judges, *to examine their pretences whether theſe are ſufficient marks of ſuch a Church as they ſuppoſe; and if they are, whether they do indeed agree to theirs, and then upon a full*

* All this is lately granted by the *Catholick Repreſenter*, Cap. VI.

a full conviction ſubmit to them. Now if this be their intention, 'tis then clear, let them pretend what they will, that they think us both capable of judging *in theſe matters, and that we ought to follow that, which all things conſidered, we find to be moſt* reaſonable, *which is all that we deſire.*

And for this we have here the undoubted Examples *of thoſe Eminent* Perſons *of their* own Communion *before named; who notwithſtanding the* Authority *of their* Church, *and the* deciſion *of ſo many* Councils *eſteemed by it as* General, *have yet both thought themſelves at liberty to* examine their Decrees, *and even to paſs ſentence too upon them, that they were erroneous in the* Points *here mentioned. And therefore certainly we may modeſtly deſire the ſame liberty which themſelves take; at leaſt till we can be convinced, (and that by ſuch Arguments as we ſhall be allow'd to judge of too) that there is ſuch an* infallible Guide *whom we ought in all things to follow without further inquiry, and where we may find him; and when this is done, I will for my part promiſe as freely to give up my ſelf to his Conduct, as I am till then, I think reaſonably, reſolved to follow what according to the beſt of my ability in* proving all things, *I ſhall find indeed to be* Good.

IV. *I might from the ſame* Principles, *Fourthly, argue the* Reaſonableneſs *of our* Reformation, *at leaſt in the opinion of thoſe great Men of whom we have hitherto been ſpeaking: And who thinking it allow'd to them to diſſent themſelves from the received* Doctrine *of their* Church, *which they found to be erroneous, could not but in their Conſciences juſtifie us, who, as* a National Church, *no way ſubjected*

to

to their Authority, *did the ſame*; *and by the right which every ſuch* Church *has within it ſelf*, reformed *thoſe* Errors, *which like the* Tares *were ſprung up with the* Good Seed. *This 'tis evident they muſt have approved*; *and for one of them, the* Abbot of Ville-loyne, *I have been aſſured by ſome of his intimate Acquaintance, that he had always a particular reſpect for the* Church of England, *and which others of their* Communion *at this day eſteem to be neither* Heretical *nor* Schiſmatical.

V. *But I may not inſiſt on theſe things, and will therefore finiſh this* Addreſs *with this only* remonſtrance *to them*; *That ſince it is thus evident, that for above* 1200 *years this* Doctrine *was never* eſtabliſh'd *in the* Church, *nor till then, in the opinion of their own moſt learned Men, any* matter of Faith; *ſince the Greateſt of their Writers in the* paſt Ages *have declared themſelves ſo freely concerning it as we have ſeen above, and ſome of the moſt eminent of their* Communion *in the* preſent *have ingenuouſly acknowledged that they could not believe it*; *ſince 'tis confeſs'd that the* Scripture *does not require it*; Senſe *and* Reaſon *undoubtedly oppoſe it, and the* Primitive Ages *of the* Church, *as one of their own* Authors *has very lately ſhewn, received it not*; *They will at leaſt ſuffer all theſe things to diſpoſe them to an indifferent Examination*, wherefore at laſt it is that they do believe this great Error? Upon *what* Authority *they have given up their* Senſes *to* Deluſion; *their* Reaſon *to embrace* Contradictions; *the* Holy Scripture *and* Antiquity, *to be ſubmitted to the dictates of two* Aſſemblies, *which many of themſelves eſteem to have been rather* Cabals *than* Councils:

cils: *And all to ſupport a* Doctrine, *the moſt injurious that can be to our* Saviour's *Honour; deſtructive in its nature not only of the certainty of the* Chriſtian Religion, *but of every thing elſe in the World; which if* Tranſubſtantiation *be true, muſt be all but* Viſion: *for that cannot be* true *unleſs both the* Reaſon *and the* Senſes *of all Mankind are* deceived *in judging of their* proper Objects; *and if this be ſo, we can then be ſure of nothing.*

Theſe Conſiderations, *if they ſhall incline them to an impartial view of the following* Diſcourſes, *they may poſſibly find ſomewhat in them, to ſhew the reaſonableneſs of our diſſent from them in this matter: However they ſhall at leaſt I hope engage thoſe of our own* Communion *to ſtand firm in that* Faith *which is thus ſtrongly ſupported with all ſorts of Arguments; and convince them how dangerous it is for Men to give up themſelves to ſuch* prejudices, *as neither* Senſe *nor* Reaſon, *nor the* word *of* God, *nor the* Authority *of the* beſt *and* pureſt Ages of the Church, *are able to overcome.*

A

TABLE

OF THE

Principal Matters

Contained in this

TREATISE.

PREFACE.

THE *occaſion of this Diſcourſe.* Page i

The method made uſe of for the explaining the nature of this Holy Euchariſt. iv

No Proof of Tranſubſtantiation *in Holy Scripture.* v

The riſe and eſtabliſhment of it. vi, vii

Several of their greateſt Men before the Council of Trent *believ'd it not.* vii, viii

And many have even ſince continued to disbelieve it. x

So, Picherellus. x
Cardinal du PERRON. xi
F. Barnes. xii
Monſieur de MARCA. xiii
F. SIRMOND. xv
Monſieur L——. xvii
Monſ. de Marolles. *ib.*
Others. xxiv,&c.

Conſequences *drawn from theſe Examples*:

I. *Of the danger of the* Papiſts, *eſpecially upon their own* Principles. xxvii
With reference to this Sacrament: *and therein to the*
1. *Conſecration.* xxvii
2. *Adoration.* ib.
3. *Communion in one kind.* xxix
4. *Maſs.* xxx
With reference to their entire Prieſthood. xxxi
II. *Againſt the* Infallibility *of the* Roman *Church.* xxxiii
III. *Againſt its* Authority. xxxiv
IV. *As to the Reaſonableneſs of our* Reformation. xxxvi
V. *That theſe things ought to diſpoſe thoſe of that* Communion *to an impartial ſearch into the grounds of their belief as to this matter.* xxxvii

PART I.

The Introduction.

Of the Nature *of this* Holy Sacrament *in the General.* Pag. 1

Chriſt's deſign in the Inſtitution of it. 2
That he eſtabliſh'd it upon the Ceremonies of the Jewiſh *Paſsover.* 3, 4, 5, 6
The method from hence taken to explain the nature of it. 6, 7

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

Of Tranſubſtantiation; *or the* Real Preſence *eſtabliſhed by the* Church of Rome. 8

What is the Doctrine of the Church of Rome *in this point.* ib.
---*This ſhewn upon the Principle before laid down, to be repugnant,*
1. *To the deſign and nature of this* Holy Sacrament. 12
2. *To the expreſſion it ſelf,* This is my Body. 14
The Papiſts *themſelves ſenſible of it.* 18
That the Sixth *of S.* John *does not at all favour them.* 20
---*This Doctrine ſhewn further to be repugnant,*
I. *To the beſt and pureſt* Tradition *of the Church.* 24
II. *To the right* Reaſon. 32
III. *To the common* Senſe *of all Mankind.* 36
Concluſion of this Point, and tranſition to the next. 37

CHAP. II.

Of the Real Preſence *acknowledged by the* Church of England. 41

The notion of the Real Preſence *falſly imputed, by a late Author, to our Church.* 42
In anſwer to this Four things propoſed to be conſidered,
I. *What is the true notion of the* Real Preſence *as acknowledged by the* Church of England. 43
II. *That*

II. *That this Notion has been conſtantly maintained by* our *moſt Learned and Orthodox* Divines. 46
---*So thoſe abroad*; Calvin. 47
——— Beza. 49
——— Martyr, *&c.* 51
---*For our own Divines; conſider the expreſs words of the twenty ninth Article, in K.* Edw. VI. *time* 52
——— *Archbiſhop* Cranmer. 53
——— *Biſhop* Ridley. 55
---*That the ſame continued to be the Opinion of* our Divines *after.* 56

Shewn

1. *From the Hiſtory of the Convocations proceeding as to this point in the beginning of Q.* Eliz. *Reign.* ib.

2. *From the Teſtimonies of* our Divines.
——— *Bp.* Jewell. 59
——— *Mr.* Hooker. 60
——— *Bp.* Andrews. 62
——— *A. B. of* Spalatto. 64
——— *Bp.* Montague. *ib.*
——— *Bp.* Taylor. 66
——— *Mr.* Thorndyke. 69

Whoſe Teſtimonies are cited at large: Of

1. Reformatio Legum Eccleſiaſticarum.
2. *Bp.* Morton.
3. *A. B.* Uſher.
4. *Bp.* Coſens.
5. *Dr.* Jo. White.
6. *Dr.* Fr. White.
7. *Dr.* Jackſon.
8. *Dr.* Hammond.

Whoſe Authorities are refer'd to; 71, 72

III. *That the* alterations *which have been made in our* Rubrick, *were not upon the account of* our Divines *changing their Opinions, as is vainly and falſly ſuggeſted.* 72

IV. *That*

IV. *That the* Reaſons *mentioned in our* Rubrick, *concerning the* impoſſibility of Chriſt's Natural Body's exiſting in ſeveral places at the ſame time, *is no way invalidated by any of this Author's* Exceptions *againſt it.* 77
1. *Not by his Firſt Obſervation.* ib.
2. *Nor by his Second.* 79
3. *Nor by his Third.* 80
4. *Nor by his Fourth.* 81
The Objection, of this Opinion's, being downright Zuinglianiſm; *Anſwered.* 82
And the whole concluded. 84

PART II.

CHAP. III.

Of the Adoration of the Hoſt *as preſcribed and practiſed in the* Church of Rome.

Two things propoſed to be conſidered;
I. *What the Doctrine of the* Church of England *as to this point is.* 86
Our Authors exceptions *againſt it,* Anſwered. 87
II. *What is the* Doctrine *of the* Church of Rome; *and whether what this* Author *has ſaid in favour of it may be ſufficient to warrant their Practice as to this matter.* 91
Their Doctrine *ſtated.* ibid.

The

The Defence *of it*, unſufficient: *ſhewn in* Anſwer,
1. *To his* Proteſtant Conceſſions. 93
2. *To his* Catholick Aſſertions.

Firſt.	96	*Fifth.*	102
Second.	99	*Sixth.*	103
Third.	ib.	*Seventh.*	104
Fourth.	100	*Eighth.*	104

3. *To the* Grounds *he offers of their Belief.* 105
The Lutherans *Practice no Apology for theirs.* 106

Ground	*First.*	Anſwer'd.	108
	Second.		109
	Third.		113
	Fourth.		114
	Fifth.		115

Some Arguments *propoſed, upon their* own Principles, *againſt this* Adoration. 117
Concluſion. 125

A DISCOURSE OF THE Holy Eucharist,

With particular Reference

To the two GREAT POINTS OF THE REAL PRESENCE, AND The Adoration of the HOST.

INTRODUCTION.

Of the Nature of this HOLY SACRAMENT *in the general.*

TO underſtand the true deſign of our Bleſſed Saviour, in the *Inſtitution* of this *Holy Sacrament*, we cannot, I ſuppoſe, take any better courſe than to conſider firſt of all, what Account the Sacred Writers have left us of the *Time* and *Manner* of the doing of it.

Now for this St. *Paul* tells us, 1 Cor. xi. 23. "*That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was* "*betray'd* (having first eaten the Passover according to the Law, Exod. xii. Matt. xxvi. 20.) "*took Bread, and* * Matt. xxv. "*when he had given thanks he brake it*, * *and gave* "*it to the Disciples, and said, Take, Eat*, This is my "Body which is broken for you, *This do in Remem-* "*brance of Me. After the same manner also he took the* "*Cup when he had supp'd, saying, This Cup is the* New "Testament *in my Blood: This do ye, as oft as ye Drink* "*it, in Remembrance of me.*

Such is the Account which St. *Paul* gives us of the *Original* of this *Holy Sacrament*: Nor do the Evangelists dissent from it; only that St. *Matthew* with reference to the *Cup*, adds, *Drink ye ALL of it*, Matt. xxvi. 27. to which St. *Mark* subjoins a particular Observation, and which ought not here to be pass'd by, "That *they ALL drank of it*, Mark xiv. 23.

It is not to be doubted, but that the design of our Blessed Saviour in *instituting* this *Holy Sacrament*, was to abolish the *Jewish Passover*, and to establish the Memory of another, and a much greater *Deliverance*, than that of the first-born, now to be wrought for the whole World in his Death. The *Bread* which he *brake*, and the *Wine* which he *poured out*, being such clear *Types* of his *Body* to be *broken*, his *Blood* to be *shed* for the Redemption of Mankind, that it is impossible for us to doubt of the Application.

And as God Almighty under the Law, designed that other Memorial of the *Paschal Lamb*, now changed into a so much better and more excellent Remembrance, to continue as long as the Law it self stood

ſtood in force: So this Bleſſed *Euchariſt*, eſtabliſh'd by Chriſt in the room of it, muſt no doubt have been intended by Him, to be continued in his Church, as long as the *Covenant* ſeal'd with that *Blood* which it exhibits, ſtands: And therefore, that ſince *that* ſhall never be aboliſh'd; 'tis evident that *this* alſo will remain our Duty, and be our perpetual Obligation to the end of the World.

This is the import of our Saviour's Addition, *Do this in Remembrance of Me*; and is by St. *Paul* more fully expreſſed in thoſe Words, which he immediately ſubjoyns to the Hiſtory of the Inſtitution before recited, 1 Cor. xi 26. "*For as often as ye eat this* "*Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do ſhew*, i.e. in the "*Jewiſh* Phraſe, ſet forth, Commemorate *the Lord's* "*Death till his coming.*

And that this Holy *Sacrament* now eſtabliſh'd in the place of the *Jewiſh Paſſover*, might be both the better underſtood, and the eaſier received by them; it is a thing much to be remarked for the right explaining of it, how exactly he accommodated all the Notions and Ideas of that Ancient *Ceremony* to this new *Inſtitution.*

I. In that *Paſchal Supper*, the Maſter of the Houſe took *Bread*, and preſenting it before them, inſtead of the uſual *Benediction of the Bread*, brake it, and gave it to them, ſaying, † *This is the Bread of Affliction which our Fathers ate in* Egypt. In this *Sacred Feaſt*, our Saviour in like manner takes *Bread*, the very *Loaf*, which the *Jews* were wont to take for the Ceremony before mentioned; breaks it, and gives it to his Diſciples, ſaying,

† See Dr. *Hammond* on Mat. xxvi. lit. e. Caſaubon in Mat. xxvi. 26, *&c.*

saying, *This is my Body which is broken for you*; alluding thereby, not only to their *Ceremony* in his *Action*, but even to their very manner of Speech in his Expression, to the *Passover* before them, which in their Language they constantly called, * the *Body* of the *Paschal Lamb*.

* גופו של פסח

Vid. Buktorf. Vindic. contr. Capel. p. 14. *Hammond* in Mat. xxvi. l. c. *&c.*

II. In that *Ancient Feast*, the Master of the House in like manner after Supper took the *Cup*, and having given thanks, gave it to them, saying, † *This is the Fruit of the Vine, and the Blood of the Grape*. In this *Holy Sacrament* our Blessed Lord in the very same manner takes the *Cup*, he Blesses it, and gives it to his Disciples, saying, *This Cup is the* New Testament *in my Blood*; his *Action* being again the very same with theirs; and for his *Expression*, it is that which *Moses* used, when he ratified the Ancient Covenant between God and the *Jews*; [Exod. xxiv. 8. compared with *Hebr.* ix. 20.] saying, *This is the Blood of the Testament*.

† Allix prepar. a la Sainte Cene. cap. 2. pag. 16.

III. In that *Ancient Feast*, after all this was finish'd, they were wont to sing a * *Hymn*, the Psalms yet extant, from the cxiii. to the cxix. thence called by them, *the Great Hallelujah*. In this *Holy Supper* our Saviour and his Disciples are expressly recorded to have done the like, and very probably in the self-same words. [See *Matt.* xxvi. 30. *Mark* xiv. 26.] In a word, *Lastly*,

* Dr. *Lightfoot*'s Heb. & Talmud. Observat. on Mat. xxvi. ver. 26, 27. T. 2. p. 258, 260.

IV. That *ancient Passover* the *Jews* were commanded to keep in memory of their *Deliverance* out of *Egypt*. The bitter Herbs were a * *remembrance* of the bitter servitude they underwent there, *Exod.* i. 14.

* זכר

The

The red Wine was a † *Memorial* of the Blood of the Children of *Iſrael* ſlain by *Pharaoh*: And for this they were expreſly commanded by *Moſes*, Exod. xiii. 8. to * *SHEW*, *i.e.* to annunciate or tell forth to their Children what the Lord had done for them. And ſo in this *Holy Sacrament*, Chriſt expreſly inſtitutes it for the ſame end, * *Do this*, ſays he, *in remembrance of me*; which St. *Paul* thus explains, 1 *Cor.* xi. 26. "*For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do* (or rather, *do ye*) * *SHEW* (the very word before uſed) "*the Lord's death till his* "*coming*.

† לזכר

* והגדת לבנך

* Εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

* Τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου καταγγέλλετε.

So clear an Alluſion does every part of this *Sacrament* bear to that ancient *Solemnity*; and we muſt be more blind than the *Jews* themſelves, not to ſee, that as that other *Sacrament* of *Baptiſm* was inſtituted by Chriſt from the Practice and Cuſtom of the † *Jewiſh* Doctors, who received their Proſelytes by the like waſhing; ſo was this Holy *Euchariſt* eſtabliſht upon the Analogy which we have ſeen to the *Paſchal Supper*, whoſe place it ſupplies, and whoſe Ceremonies it ſo exactly retains, that it ſeems only to have heightned the deſign, and changed the Application to a more excellent Remembrance.

† See Dr *Hammond*'s Practical Catechiſm Lib. 6. pag. 115 Oper. fol. Lond. 1684.

I know not how far it may be allow'd to confirm this Analogie, That it was one of the moſt ancient Traditions among the * *Jews* of old, that the *Meſſiah* ſhould come and work out their deliverance, *The very ſame night in which God had brought them out of Egypt, the night of the Paſchal Solemnity*. But

* Vid. Fagium in Annotat. in Exod. xii. 13. where he renders their words thus, "*Et in eadem dit, viz.* xv. *menſis Niſan, ſc. Martii, redimendus eſt Iſrael in diebus Meſſiæ. Vid. Vol.* 1. *Critic. M.* p. 498.

certain-

certainly conſiderable it is, that as God under the Law, the ſame night in which he deliver'd them, inſtituted the *Paſſover* to be a perpetual *Memorial* of it throughout their Generations; ſo here our Saviour inſtituted his *Communion* not only in the ſame Night in which he deliver'd us, but immediately after having eaten His laſt *Paſſover*; to ſhew us, that what that *Solemnity* had hitherto been to the *Jews*, this *Sacrament* ſhould from henceforth be to *us*; and that we by this Ceremony ſhould commemorate ours, as they by that other had been commanded to do their Deliverance.

This the Holy *Scriptures* themſelves direct us to, by ſo often calling our Bleſſed Saviour in expreſs terms, "*The Lamb of God*, *Joh.* i. 29. St. *Peter* ſpeking of our Redemption wrought by Him, tells us, that it was not obtained by "*corruptible things*, "*ſuch as ſilver and gold*, *but by the precious Blood of* "*Chriſt*, *as of a* Lamb *without blemiſh*, *and without* "*ſpot*, 1 *Pet.* i. 18. And St. *Paul* ſo clearly directs us to this alluſion, that no poſſible doubt can remain of it; "*Chriſt*, ſays he, *our* Paſſover *is ſacri-* "*ficed for us*, *therefore let us keep the Feaſt*, 2 Cor. i. v. 7.

And now after ſo many Arguments for this *Application*, as, being joined together, I think I might almoſt call a Demonſtration of it; I ſuppoſe I may without ſcruple lay down this foundation both for the unfolding of the nature of this Holy *Sacrament* in the general, and for the Examination of thoſe two great *points* I am here to conſider in particular, *viz.* That our Saviour in this *Inſtitution* addreſſing himſelf to *Jews*, and ſpeaking in the direct form

form of the *Paſchal* Phraſes; and a *Ceremony* which 'tis thus evident he deſigned to introduce in the ſtead of that *Solemnity*; The beſt method we can take for explaining both the *words* and *intent* of this *Communion*, will be to examine what ſuch men to whom he ſpake muſt neceſſarily have conceived to be his meaning, but eſpecially on an occaſion wherein it neither became him to be obſcure; and the Apoſtles ſilence, not one of them demanding any explication of his words, as at other times they were wont to do, clearly ſhewing that he was not difficult to be underſtood.

This only *Poſtulate* being granted, which I think I have ſo good reaſon to expect; I ſhall now go on to examine by it, the firſt great *Point* propoſed to be conſider'd, *viz.* Of the *Real Preſence* of Chriſt in this *Holy Sacrament*, and that

1*ſt*. As eſtabliſhed by the Church of *Rome*.
2*dly*. As acknowledged by the Church of *England*.

PART

PART I.

CHAP. I.

Of TRANSUBSTANTIATION, *Or the* Real Preſence *eſtabliſh'd by the* CHURCH of ROME.

* Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 13. cap. 4. & Can. 2.

TRanſubſtantiation is defined by the * *Council of Trent*, to be "*A WONDERFUL* "*CONVERSION of the whole Sub-* "*ſtance of the* Bread, *in this Holy Sacrament*, "*into the whole ſubſtance of the* Body of Chriſt, *and of* "*the whole ſubſtance of the* Wine *into his* Blood; *the* "*Species or Accidents only of the* Bread *and* Wine *re-* "*maining*.

For the better underſtanding of which *Wonderful Converſion*, becauſe the Church of *Rome*, which is not very liberal in any of her Inſtructions, has taken † particular care that this ſhould not be too much explain'd to the People, as well knowing it to be a Doctrine ſo abſurd, that even their credulity could hardly be able to digeſt it; it may not be amiſs if, from the very words of their own *Catechiſm*, we examine a little farther into it.

† Catechiſmus ad Parochos, Par. II. cap. de Euch. Sacr. n. 39, 41, 45.

Now three things there are, which, they tell us, muſt be conſider'd in it:

I. That

I. (*a*) That the *true Body* of Chriſt our Lord, the "very ſame that was *Born* of the *Virgin*, and now "ſits in Heaven at the right hand of the Father, is "contained in this Sacrament.

(*a*) Catech ib. n. xxv. Sect. Primum.

"Now by the *true Body*, they mean not only "his *Human Body*, and whatſoever belongs to it, "as *Bones*, *Sinews*, &c. to be contain'd in this Sacra-"ment; ‖ But the *intire Chriſt*, God and Man; ſo "that the *Euchariſtical Elements* are changed into "our Saviour, as to *both* his *Subſtances*, and the "conſequences of *both*, his *Blood*, *Soul*, and *Di-"vinity* it ſelf, all which are really preſent in "this Sacrament; * the *Body* of Chriſt by the "*Conſecration*, the reſt by *Concomitance* with the "*Body*.

‖ Ib. n. xxxi. Sect. *Totus Chriſtus ut Deus & Homo in Euchariſtia continetur.*

* Ib. n. xxxiii. Sect. *Per Concomitantiam in Euch. quæ ſint.*

Again: When 'tis ſaid, "† That the *whole Sub-"ſtance* of the *Bread* is changed into his *whole Body*, "and the *whole Subſtance* of the *Wine* into his *whole "Blood*; this is not to be ſo underſtood, as if the "*Bread* did not contain the *whole Subſtance* of his "*Blood*, as well as of his *Body*; and ſo the *Wine*, the "*whole Subſtance* of his *Body*, as well as of his *Blood*; "(·.·) ſeeing Chriſt is intire in each part of the "Sacrament, nay in every the leaſt *Crumb* or *Drop* "of either part.

† Ib. n. xxxix. Sect. *Converſio quæ ſit in Euchar. &c.*

(·.·) Ibid. n. xxxv. Sect. *Chriſtus totus in qualibet particula, &* n. xlii. &c.

II. "The † ſecond thing to be conſider'd for "the underſtanding of this Myſtery, is, That not "any part of the *Subſtance* of the *Bread* and *Wine* "remains; tho' *nothing may ſeem more contrary to "the Senſes than this*; in which they are certainly "in the right.

† Ib. n. xxv. Sect. Secundum.

III. † "That the *Accidents* of the *Bread* and *Wine*, "which either our *Eyes ſee* (as the *Colour*, *Form*, &c.) "or our *other Senſes perceive* (as the *Taſt*, *Touch*, "*Smell*) all theſe are in no *Subject*, but exiſt by themſelves, after a *wonderful manner*, and which cannot "be explain'd.

† Ibid. n. xxv. Sect. Tertium & n. xliv. Sect. *Accid. ſine ſubjecto conſt. in Euch.*

For the reſt, the *Converſion* it ſelf, " † It is "very difficult to be comprehended, How Chriſt's "*Body*, which before Conſecration, was not in the "Sacrament, ſhould now come to be there, ſince "'tis certain that *it changes not its place*, but is "ſtill all the while in Heaven. Nor is it made "preſent there by *Creation*, * nor by any *other* "*Change*; For it is neither increaſed nor diminiſh'd, but remains whole in its Subſtance as before. † Chriſt is not in the Sacrament *Locally*; "for he has no *Quantity* there, is neither *Great* nor "*Little*. (*a*) In a word, Men ought not to "inquire too curiouſly, how this *Change* can be "made, for it is not to be comprehended, ſeeing "neither in any natural Changes, nor indeed in the "whole Creation, is there any Example of any "thing like it.

† Ib. n. xxxvii. Sect Primo natione.

* Ib. n. xxxix. Sect. *Converſio quæ ſit in Euch. &c.*

† Ib. n. xliii. *Quonam modo Chriſtus exiſtat in Euchar.*

(*a*) Ibid. n. xli. Sect. *De Tranſubſtant. curioſius non inquirendum.*

Such is the Account which themſelves give of this *Myſtery*: From all which we may in ſhort conclude the State of the Queſtion before us, to be this; That we do not diſpute at all about Chriſt's *Real Preſence*, which after a *Spiritual* and *Heavenly* Manner, we acknowledge in this Holy Euchariſt, as we ſhall hereafter ſhew; nor by conſequence of the *Truth* of Chriſt's *Words* which we undoubtedly believe: But only about this *Manner* of his *Preſence*, *viz.* Whether the *Bread* and the

the *Wine* be changed into the very natural *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt, ſo that the *Bread* and *Wine* themſelves do no longer remain; But that under the *Appearance* of them is contain'd that ſame *Body* of Chriſt, which was *Born* of the Bleſſed *Virgin*, with his *Soul* and *Divinity*; which ſame *Body* of Chriſt, tho, *extended* in all its parts in Heaven, is at the ſame time in the Sacrament without any *Extenſion*, neither *Great* nor *Small*, comes thither neither by *Generation*, nor by *Creation*, nor by any *local Motion*; foraſmuch as it continues ſtill at the right hand of God in Heaven, at the very ſame inſtant that it exiſts *whole* and *intire* in every conſecrated *Hoſt*, or *Chalice*; nay more, is *whole* and *intire*, not only in the *whole Hoſt*, or the *whole Chalice*; but in every the *leaſt Crumb* of the *Hoſt*, and every the *leaſt Drop* of the *Chalice*, here upon Earth.

And here it might well be thought a very needleſs, indeed an extravagant undertaking, to prove that thoſe Elements, which ſo many of our Senſes tell us, continue after their Conſecration the very ſame, as to what concerns their *natural Subſtance*, that they were before, are in reality the very ſame: That what all the World *Sees*, and *Feels*, and *Smells*, and *Taſts*, to be *Bread* and *Wine*, is not changed into the very natural *Fleſh* and *Blood* of a Body actually before exiſtent; had it not entred into the Minds of ſo great a part of the Chriſtian Church to joyn in the maintaining of a *Paradox*, which has nothing to defend it, but that fond Preſumption they have certainly done well to take up, That they cannot poſſibly

be in the *wrong*, and without which it would be very difficult for them to perſwade any ſober man that they are in the *right*.

To ſhew that thoſe *words*, which they tell us, work all this *Miracle*, and are the only reaſon that engages them to maintain ſo many abſurdities as are confeſſedly the unavoidable Conſequences of this Doctrine, have no ſuch force nor interpretation as they pretend; I muſt deſire it may be remembred what I before remark'd, That this Holy *Sacrament* was eſtabliſh'd by our Saviour in the room of the *Jewiſh Paſſover*, and upon the very *Words* and *Ceremonies* of it. So that, if in that all things were *Typical*; the *Feaſt*, the *Cuſtoms*, the *Expreſſions* meerly *alluſive* to ſomething that had been done before, and of which this ſacred Ceremony was the *memorial*; we ought in all reaſon to conclude, that both our Saviour muſt have deſigned, and his Apoſtles underſtood this Holy *Sacrament* to have been the ſame too.

Now as to the *Nature* of the *Paſſover*; we have already ſeen that it was appointed by God as a *Remembrance* of his delivery of the *Jews* out of the Land of *Egypt*, when he ſlew all the *firſt-born* of the *Egyptians*, *Exod.* xii. The *Lamb* which they ate every year in this Feaſt, was an Euchariſtical Sacrifice and *Type* of that firſt *Lamb* which was ſlain in the night of their deliverance, and whoſe bloud ſprinkled upon the Poſts of their Doors had preſerved their Fore-fathers from the *deſtroying Angel*, that he ſhould not do them any miſchief. The *Bread* of *Affliction*, which they broke, and of which they ſaid, perhaps in the very † ſame manner that

† Vid. Cameron. Annot. in Matt. xxvi. 26. in illa verba, Λάβετε, φάγετε, inter Critic. pag. 780. l. 24.

Chriſt

Chriſt did of the very ſame Loaf, *Take, Eat, This is the Bread of affliction which our Fathers ate in Egypt*; they eſteem'd a *Type* and *Figure* of that unleaven'd *Bread* which their Forefathers ſo many Ages before had eaten there; and upon that account called it ‖ "*The Memorial of their delivery out of Egypt.* † The *Cup of Bleſſing* which they bleſſed, and of which they *ALL drank* in this Feaſt, they did it at once in memory both of the *Blood* of the Children of *Iſrael* ſlain by *Pharaoh*, and of the *Blood* of the *Lamb*, which being *ſprinkled* upon their *doors*, preſerved their own from being ſhed with that of the *Egyptians*.

‖ Allix. Serm. pag. 503.

† *Hammond* Pract. Catechiſm, lib. vi. pag. 129. Ed. fol.

Now all theſe *Idea's* with which the Apoſtles had ſo long been acquainted, could not but preſently ſuggeſt to them the ſame deſign of our Bleſſed Saviour in the *Inſtitution* of this Holy *Sacrament*: That when *He*, as the *Maſter* of the *Feaſt*, took the *Loaf*, *Bleſſed*, and *brake* it, and *gave* it to them, and bid them in like manner henceforward, *Do this in Remembrance of Him*; He certainly deſigned that by this Ceremony, which hitherto they had uſed in *memory* of their deliverance out of *Egypt*, they ſhould now continue the *memory* of their Bleſſed Lord, and of that deliverance which he was about to work for them. That as by calling the *Lamb* in that Feaſt, "The *Body of the Paſſover*, they underſtood that it was the *remembrance* of God's mercy in commanding the *deſtroying Angel* to *paſs over* their Houſes when he ſlew their Enemies; the *memorial* of the *Lamb* which was killed for this purpoſe in *Egypt*; ſo Chriſt calling the *Bread* his *Body*, nay, his *Body broken* for

them,

them, could certainly mean nothing elſe but that it was the *Type*, the *Memorial* of his *Body*, which as yet was not, but was now juſt ready to be given for their redemption.

This is ſo natural a reflection, and in one Part at leaſt of his Holy Sacrament ſo neceſſary too, that 'tis impoſſible to explain it otherwiſe. "*This Cup*, ſays our Saviour, *is the New Teſtament in my Blood*; That is, as * *Moſes* had before ſaid of the *Old Teſtament* in the very ſame Phraſe, the *ſeal*, the *ratification* of it. Now if thoſe words be taken *literally*, then 1*ſt*. 'Tis the *Cup* that is *Tranſubſtantiated*, not the *Wine*; 2*ly*, It is *changed* not into *Chriſt*'s *Blood* (as they pretend) but into the *New Teſtament* in his Blood; which being confeſſedly abſurd and impoſſible, it muſt in all reaſon follow, That the Apoſtles underſtood our Saviour alike in both His Expreſſions; and that by conſequence we ought to interpret theſe words, *This is my Body which is broken for you*, of the *Bread*'s being the *Type*, or *Figure* of his *Body*; as we muſt that of the *Cup*, That it was the *New Teſtament in his Blood*, i. e. the *ſign*, or *ſeal* of the *New Teſtament*.

† See *Exod.* xxiv. 8. *Hib.* ix. 20. And this Alluſion is applied by S. *Peter*, 1 Ep. i. 2 Vid. *Hammond.* Annot. in loc. tit. a.

So naturally do all theſe Notions direct us to a *figurative* interpretation of his Words; the whole *deſign* of this *Inſtitution*, and all the *Parts* and *Ceremonies* of it being plainly *Typical*, in *Remembrance* (as Chriſt himſelf has told us) *of Him*. But now if we go on more particularly to inquire into the Expreſſion it ſelf, *This is my Body which is broken for you*, That will yet more clearly confirm this interpretation.

It

It has before been obſerved, That theſe words of our Saviour in this Holy *Sacrament*, were uſed by him inſtead of that other Expreſſion of the *Maſter* in the *Paſchal Feaſt*, when in the very ſame manner he took the very ſame *Bread* into his Hands, and *bleſſed* it, and *brake* it, and *gave* it to thoſe who were at the Table with him, ſaying, *This is the Bread of affliction which our Fathers ate in Egypt.* And can any thing in the World be more plain, than that as never any *Jew* yet imagined, that the *Bread* which they thus took every year, was by that ſaying of the *Maſter* of their Feaſt changed into the very *ſubſtance* of that *Bread* which their forefathers had ſo many Ages before conſumed in *Egypt*, in the night of their deliverance; but being thus broken and given to them, became a *Type*, a *Figure*, a *Memorial* of it: So neither could thoſe to whom our Saviour Chriſt now ſpake, and who as being *Jews* had ſo long been uſed to this *Phraſe*, ever imagine, that the pieces of that *Loaf* which He *brake*, and gave them, ſaying, "*This is my Body* "*which is broken for you*, *Do this in Remembrance of* "*me*, became thereupon the *very Body* of that Saviour from whoſe Hands they received it; and who did not ſure with one *member* of his *Body*, give away his *whole Body* from himſelf to them; but only deſigned that by this Ceremony they ſhould *remember* Him, and his *Body broken* for them, as by the ſame they had hitherto *remembred* the *Bread of affliction which their Fathers ate in Egypt.*

I ought not to omit it, becauſe it very much confirms the force of this Argument, That what I have here ſaid of this *Analogy* of the Holy *Euchariſt*, to the

Jewiſh

Jewiſh Paſſover, was not the original remark of any *Proteſtant*, or indeed of any other Chriſtians differing from the *Church* of *Rome* in this point: But was objected to them long before the *Reformation*, by the ‖ *Jews* themſelves, to ſhew that in their literal Interpretation of theſe Words, they had manifeſtly departed from the intention of our Bleſſed Saviour, and advanced a notion in which 'twas impoſſible for his Apoſtles, or any other acquainted, as they were, with the *Paſchal* forms, ever to have underſtood him. And if † S. *Auguſtine*, who I ſuppoſe will not be thought a Heretick by either party, may be allow'd to ſpeak for the Chriſtians; he tells us, we are to look upon the Phraſe, *This is my Body*, juſt, ſays He, as when in ordinary converſation we are wont to ſay, This is *Chriſtmas*, or *Good-Friday*, or *Eaſter-day*; Not that this is the very day on which Chriſt was *born*, or *ſuffer'd*, or *roſe* from the dead, but the return or remembrance of that day on which Chriſt was *born*, or *ſuffer'd*, or *roſe* again.

‖ Vid. apud Author. Fortalitii Fidei, Lib. 4. Conſid. 6. Impoſ. 10. Thoſe who have not this Book, may find the Quotation at large in the late Edition of *Joan. Pariſienſis*, in Præfat pag. 73, 74.

† Epiſtol. xxiii. ad *Bonifac.* Vol. 2. pag. 29. Oper. Ed. Ludg. 1664.

It is wonderful to conſider with what confidence our new *Miſſionaries* produce theſe words on all occaſions; and thereby ſhew us how fond they would be of the Holy Scripture, and how willingly they would make it their *Guide in Controverſie*, did it but ever ſo little favour their Cauſe. Can any thing, ſay they, be more expreſs, *This is my Body?* Is it poſſible for words to be ſpoken more clear and poſitive? And indeed were all the Expreſſions of Holy Scripture to be taken in their *literal* meaning, I will not deny, but that thoſe words might as evidently

evidently prove *Bread* to be Chriſt's *Body* as thoſe other in St. *John*, *I am the Bread that came down from Heaven*, argue a contrary *Tranſubſtantiation* of Chriſt's *Body* into *Bread*, John vi. 48, 51. or thoſe more uſual inſtances, *I am the true Vine*; *I am the door of the ſheep*; *That Rock was Chriſt*; prove a great many *Tranſubſtantiations* more, *viz.* of our Saviour into a *Vine*, a *Door*, and a *Rock*. But now, if for all this plainneſs and poſitiveneſs in theſe expreſſions, they themſelves tell us, That it would be ridiculous to conclude from hence, that Chriſt was indeed turned into all theſe, and many other the like things; they may pleaſe to give us leave to ſay the ſame of this before us, it being neither leſs impoſſible, nor leſs unreaſonable to ſuppoſe *Bread* to be changed into Chriſt's *Body*, than for Chriſt's *Body* to be changed into *Bread*, a *Vine*, a *Door*, a *Rock*, or whatever you pleaſe of the like kind.

But I have already ſhewn the ground of this miſtake to be their want of conſidering the *Cuſtoms* and *Phraſes* of the *Jewiſh Paſſover*, and upon which, both the Holy *Euchariſt* it ſelf, and theſe *Expreſſions* in it were founded: And I will only add this farther, in confirmation of it; That in the Stile of the *Hebrew* Language in general, there is nothing more ordinary, than for things to be ſaid to * *Be* that which they *Signifie* or *Repreſent*. Thus *Joſeph* interpreting *Pharaoh*'s Dream,

† Expreſſions of this kind are very frequent in Holy Scripture. *The ſeed is the Word of God*, Luke viii. 11. *The field is the World*; *the good ſeed are the Children of the kingdom*: *The tares are the Children of the wicked one*, Matt. xiii. 38. *The ſeven Angels are the Angels of the ſeven Churches*; and *the ſeven Candleſticks are the ſeven Churches*, Rev. i. 20. with infinite more of the like kind.

Gen xli. 26. *The ſeven good Kine*, ſays he, *are ſeven years*; and again, The *ſeven good Ears of Corn are ſeven years*; i. e. as is plain, they *ſignify ſeven years*. And ſo in like manner in this place: *Chriſt took Bread, and bleſſed, and brake it, and gave it to his diſciples, ſaying, Take, Eat, This is my body which is broken for you*: That is, this *Bread* thus *Taken*, and *Bleſſed*, and *Broken*, and *Given* to you; This *Bread*, and this *Action*, *ſignifies* and *repreſents* my *Body* which ſhall be *broken* for you.

And indeed, after all this ſeeming aſſurance, it is nevertheleſs plain, That they themſelves are not very well ſatisfied with their own interpretation. † We have ſhewn before, how little confidence their greateſt *Schoolmen* had of this Doctrine; thoſe who have ſtood the moſt ſtifly for it, could never yet † agree how to explain theſe words, ſo as to prove it: And Cardinal *Bellarmine* alone, who reckons up the moſt part of their ſeveral ways, and argues the weakneſs too of every one but his own, may be ſufficient to aſſure us, that they are never likely to be: And might ſerve to ſhew what juſt cauſe their own great * *Catharnus* had ſo long ſince to cry out, upon his Enquiry only into the meaning of the very firſt word, *This*: "*Conſider*, ſays he, *Reader, into what diffi-*
"*culties they are thrown, who go about to write up-*
"*on this matter, when the word THIS only has had*
"*ſo many, and ſuch contradictory Expoſitions, that*
"*they are enough to make a man loſe his Wits, but*
"*barely to conſider them all.*

† See the Preface.

† See their Opinions collected by Monſieur *Aubertine* de Euchariſtiâ, lib. 1. cap. 9. 11, 12, 13, 14.

* Tract. 2. de Verbis quibus conficitur.

'Twas

'Twas this forced ſo many of their † greateſt and moſt learned men before *Luther*, ingenuouſly to profeſs, That *there was not* in *Scripture any evident proof of this Doctrine*; and even *Cardinal Cajetan* ſince to own, That had not the Church determined for the *literal* ſenſe of thoſe words, *This is my Body*, they might have paſſed in the *Metaphorical*.

† See their Teſtimonies cited in the late *Hiſtorical Treatiſe of Tranſubſtantiation*; in the *Defence of the Expoſition of the Church of* England, p. 63. 64, 65. In the Preface above, *&c.*

It is the general acknowledgment of their ‖ greateſt Writers at this day, That if the *Pronoun THIS* in that Propoſition, *This is my Body*, be referr'd to the *Bread*, which our Saviour Chriſt *held* in his *Hand*, which he *bleſs'd*, which he *brake* and *gave* to his Diſciples, and of which therefore certainly, if of any thing, he ſaid, *This is my Body*, the natural repugnancy that there is between the two things affirm'd of one another, *Bread* and *Chriſt's Body*, will force them to be taken in a *figurative* Interpretation: For as much as 'tis impoſſible that *Bread* ſhould be *Chriſt's Body* otherwiſe than in a *figure*. And however, to avoid ſo dangerous a Conſequence, they will rather apply it to *any thing*, nay to *nothing* at all, than to the *Bread*; yet they would do well to conſider, whether they do not thereby fall into as great a danger on the other ſide ſince; if the *Relative THIS* do's not determine thoſe words to the *Bread*, 'tis evident that nothing in that whole *Propoſition* do's; And then how thoſe words ſhall work ſo great a change in a *Subject* to which

‖ See *Bellarmin*'s words in the *Defence of the Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church of* England, pag 56, 57. To which may be added, *Salmer.* Tom. 9. Tr. 20. *Suarez.* Diſp. 58 Sect. 7. *Vaſquez.* Diſp. 201. c. 1. &c.

they have no manner of *Relation*, will, I believe, be as difficult to ſhew, as the change it ſelf is incomprehenſible to conceive.

And now after ſo plain an evidence of the weakneſs of that foundation which is by all confeſſed to be the chief, and has by many of the moſt Learned of that Church been thought the only Pillar of this Cauſe; I might well diſpenſe with my ſelf from entring on any farther examination of their other pretences to eſtabliſh it. But becauſe they have taken great pains of late to apply the † ſixth Chapter of St. *John* to the Holy *Euchariſt*, tho' it might be ſufficient in general to ſay that no good Argument for a matter of ſuch conſequence, can be built upon a place which ſo many of the * moſt *Eminent* and *Learned* of that *Communion* have judged not to have the leaſt Relation to this matter; yet I will nevertheleſs beg leave very briefly to ſhew the Weakneſs of this *Second* Attempt too; and that 'tis in vain that they rally theſe ſcatter'd Forces, whilſt their main Body continues ſo intirely defeated.

†Concil. Trid. Seſſ. xiii.

* See them thus ranged by *Albertinus* de Euch lib. 1. cap. 30 pag. 209. Two *Popes*; Innocent III. Pius II. Four *Cardinals*, Bonaventure, D'Alliaco, Cuſan. Cajetane. Two *Archbiſhops*, Richardus Armachanus, & Guererius Granatenſis. Five *Biſhops*, Stephanus Eduenſis, Durandus Mimatenſis, Gulielmus Altiſiodorenſis, Lindanus Ruremondenſis, & Janſenius Gandavenſis. *Doctors and Profeſſors* of *Divinity* in great abundance; Alexander Alenſis, Richardus de media villa, Jo. Gerſon, Jo de Raguſio, Gabriel Biel, Thomas Waldenſis, Author. tract. contr. perfidiam quorundam Bohemorum, Jo. Maria Varratus, Tilmannus Segebergenſis, Aſteſanus, Conradus, Jo. Ferus, Conradus Saſgerus, Jo. Heſſelius, Ruardus Tapperus, Palatios, & Rigaltius. Here are 30. of the *Roman* Church, who reject this Application of this Chapter. For the *Fathers*, ſee the Learned *Paraphraſe* lately ſet forth of this Chapter, in the *Preface*: All which ſhews how little ſtrength any Argument from this Chapter can have to eſtabliſh *Tranſubſtantiation*.

It

It is a little ſurprizing in this matter, that they univerſally tell us, That neither the beginning nor ending of our Saviour's Diſcourſe in that Chapter belongs to this Matter; that both before and after that paſſage which they refer to; 'tis all *Metaphor*; only juſt two or three words for their purpoſe, *Literal.* But that which raiſes our wonder to the higheſt pitch, is, that the very fifty firſt *Verſe* it ſelf on which they found their Argument, is two thirds of it *Figure*, and only otherwiſe in one Clauſe to ſerve their *Hypotheſis.*

"*I am*, ſays our Saviour, *the living Bread* "*which came down from Heaven*; This is Fi-"gurative: *If any man eat of this Bread, he* "*ſhall live for ever*; That is, they ſay, by a "Spiritual Eating by Faith: *And the Bread* "*which I will give, is my Fleſh, which I will* "*give for the life of the World.* This only "muſt be underſtood of a *proper* manducation, "of a *real* eating of his Fleſh in this Holy Sa-"crament.

It muſt be confeſſed, that this is an Arbitrary way of explaining indeed, and becomes the Character of a Church whoſe dictates are to be *received*, not *examined*; and may therefore paſs well enough amongſt thoſe, with whom the ſuppoſed *Infallibility* of their *Guides*, is thought a ſufficient diſpenſation for their own *private Conſideration.* But for us, who can ſee no reaſon for this ſudden change of our Saviour's Diſcourſe; nay

nay think that the connexion of that laſt Clauſe with the foregoing, is an evident ſign that they all keep the ſame *Character*; and are therefore not a little ſcandalized at ſo *Capernaitical* a Comment, as indeed "*Who can bear it? V.* 60 They will pleaſe to excuſe us, if we take our Saviour's Interpretation to be at leaſt of as good an Authority, as 'tis much more reaſonable than theirs, *V.* 62. "*Do's this*, ſays he, *offend you? Do's* my ſaying that ye muſt *eat my fleſh*, and *drink my Blood* ſcandalize you? Miſtake not my deſign, I mean not any *carnal eating* of me; that indeed might juſtly move your Horrour; "*It* "*is the Spirit that quickneth, the fleſh profiteth no-*"*thing; the words that I ſpeak unto you, they are ſpi-*"*rit, and they are life.*

He that deſires a fuller account of this Chapter, may pleaſe to recur to the late excellent † *Paraphraſe* ſet out on purpoſe to explain it, and which will be abundantly ſufficient to ſhew the reaſonableneſs of that *Interpretation* which we give of it. I ſhall only add, to cloſe all, that one Remark which * Saint *Auguſtine* has left us concerning it, and ſo much the rather in that it is one of the rules which he lays down for the right Interpreting of Holy Scripture, and illuſtrates with this particular Example: "*If*, ſays he, *the ſaying be Preceptive,* "*either forbidding a wicked action, or commanding to* "*do that which is good, it is no Figurative ſay-*"*ing: But if it ſeems to command any Villany,* "*or*

† A Paraphraſe with Notes, and a Preface upon the Sixth Chapter of Saint *John*, *Lond.* 1686.

* De Doctrin. Chriſtian Lib. 3. Cap. 16.

" *or Wickedneſs, or forbid what is profitable and good,*
" *it is Figurative. This ſaying*, Except ye eat
" the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his
" Blood, you have no Life in you, *ſeems to command*
" *a Villanous or Wicked Thing: It is therefore a*
" *FIGURE, enjoining us to communicate in the*
" *Paſſion of our Lord, and to lay it up in dear and*
" *profitable Remembrance, that his Fleſh was crucified and*
" *wounded for our ſakes.*

And now having thus clearly, I perſwade my ſelf, ſhewn the Weakneſs of thoſe Grounds, on which this Doctrine of the *ſubſtantial Change* of the *Bread* and *Wine* into the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt in this Holy Sacrament is eſtabliſh'd, I ſhall but very little inſiſt on any other Arguments againſt it: Only in a Word, to demonſtrate, that all manner of *Proofs* fail them in this great *Error*, I will in the cloſe here ſubjoin two or three ſhort *Conſiderations* more, to ſhew this *Doctrine* oppoſite, not only to *Holy Scripture*, as we have ſeen, but alſo,

I. To the beſt and pureſt *Tradition of the Church.*

II. To the *Right Reaſon*, and

III. To the *Common Senſes* of all Mankind.

I. *That*

I. *That this Doctrine is oppoſite to the beſt and pureſt* Tradition *of the* Church.

Now to ſhew this, I ſhall not heap together a multitude of Quotations out of thoſe Fathers, through whoſe hands this *Tradition* muſt have paſt: He that deſires ſuch an Account, may find it fully done by one of the *Roman Communion*, in a little * Treatiſe juſt now publiſh'd in our own Language. I will rather take a method that ſeems to me leſs liable to any juſt Exception, and that is to lay down ſome *general Remarks* of undoubted Truth, and whoſe conſequence will be as evident as their certainty is unqueſtionable. And,

* A Treatiſe of Tranſubſtantiation, by one of the Church of *Rome*, *&c.* Printed for *Rich. Chiſwell.* 1687.

I. For the *Expreſſions* of the Holy Fathers; It is not deny'd, but that in their popular Diſcourſes they have ſpared no words (except that of *Tranſubſtantiation*, which not one of them ever uſed) to ſet off ſo great a *Myſtery*: And I believe that were the *Sermons* and *Devotional* Treatiſes of our own Divines alone, ſince the *Reformation*, ſearcht into, one might find Expreſſions among them, as much overſtrain'd. * And

Such are μεταποίησις, μεταβολὴ, μεταρρύθμισις, μετάλημψις, μετασοιχείωσις, but never μετουσίωσις. And Note, there is hardly any of theſe Words, which they have applied to the *Bread* and *Wine* in the *Euchariſt*, but they have attributed the ſame to the *Water* in *Baptiſm.*

* See Treatiſe firſt, of the Adoration, *&c.* Printed lately at *Oxford*; Which would make the World believe that we hold, I know not what imaginary *Real Preſence* on this account; juſt as truly, as the *Fathers* did *Tranſubſtantiation.*

doubtleſs

doubtleſs theſe would be as ſtrong an Argument to prove *Tranſubſtantiation* now the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, as thoſe to argue it to have been the Opinion of thoſe Primitive Ages.

But now let us conſult theſe men in their more exact compoſures, when they come to teach, not to declaim, and we ſhall find they will then tell us, That theſe Elements are for their * *ſubſtance* what they were before, *Bread* and *Wine*: That they retain the true *properties* of their nature to *nouriſh* and *feed* the *Body*: that they are things *inanimate*, and void of *ſenſe*: That with reference to the Holy Sacrament they are *Images*, *Figures*, *Signes*, *Symbols*, *Memorials*, *Types* and *Antitypes* of the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt. That in their *Uſe* and *Benefit*, they are indeed the very *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt to every faithful Receiver, but in a *Spiritual* and *Heavenly* manner, as we confeſs: That, in propriety of ſpeech the *Wicked* receive not in this Holy Sacrament the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt, although they do outwardly preſs with their teeth the Holy Elements; but rather eat and drink the Sacrament of his *Body* and *Blood* to their damnation.

* It is not neceſſary to tranſcribe the Particulars here that have been ſo often and fully alledged. Moſt of theſe Expreſſions may be found in the Treatiſe of *Tranſubſtantiation* lately publiſhed. The reſt may be ſeen in *Blondel, Eclairciſſements Familiers de la Controverſe de l' Euchariſtie, Cap.* iv, vii, viii. *Claude Rep. au* 2. *Traittè de la Perpetuité*, i. *Part. Cap.* iv, v. *Forbeſius Inſtructiones Hiſtorico-Theolog. lib.* xi. *cap.* ix, x, xi, xii, xiii, xv. *Larroque Hiſtoire de l' Euchariſtie, liv.* 2. *cap.* ii.

II. Secondly, For our Saviour's *words* which are ſuppoſed to work this great Change, 'tis evident from the *Liturgies* of the *Eaſtern* Church,

that that *Greek* Fathers did not believe them to be words of *Consecration*; but to be the same in this Holy Eucharist that the *Haggadah*, or History of the *Passover* was in that ancient Feast; That is, were read only as an account of the *Occasion* and *design* of the *Institution* of this Blessed Sacrament, not to work any Miracles in the *Consecration*. And for the * *African* Churches, they at this day expound them in this very Sacrament after such a manner, as themselves confess to be inconsistent with *Transubstantiation*, viz. *This Bread is the Body of Christ.*

This *Arcudius* himself is forced to confess of some of the latter *Greeks*, viz. That they take these Words only διηγηματικῶς, Historically. See his Book *de Concord. Lib.* 3. *Cap.* 27. And indeed all the ancient Liturgies of that Church plainly speak it; However both He and *Goar* endeavour to shift it off; in which the Prayer of Consecration is after the words of Institution, and distinct from it. So in *Liturg. S. Chrysostom. Edition. Goar. pag.* 76. *n.* 130. 132. are pronounced the Words of Institution. Then *pag.* 77. *numb.* 139. the Deacon bids the Priest, Εὐλόγησον δέσποτα τὸν ἅγιον ἄρτον. Who thereupon thus consecrates it; He first signs it three times with the sign of the Cross, and then thus prays, ποίησον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον τίμιον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου. And so the Cup afterwards.

* The same seems to have been the custom of the *African* Church, whose Prayers now used, see in *Ludolph. Histor. l.* 3. *cap.* 5. Where is also the Expression mentioned, *n.* 56. *Hic Panis est Corpus meum, &c.*

III. Let it be considered, *Thirdly*, That it was a great debate in the Primitive Church for above a thousand Years, Whether Christs *Glorified Body* had any *Blood* in it or no? Now how those Men could possibly have questioned whether *Christ's Glorified Body* had any *Blood* at all in it, had they then believed the *Cup* of *Eucharist* to have been *truly* and *really* chan-

See This whole matter deduced through the first Ages to St. *Augustine*, whom *Consentius* consulted about this very point, in a particular Treatise written by *Monsieur Allix de Sanguine Christi*, 8vo. *Paris* 1680.

changed into the *Blood* of his *Glorified Body*, as is now aſſerted, is what will hardly, I believe, be ever told us.

IV. We will add to this, *Fourthly*, their manner of oppoſing the *Heatheniſm* of the World. With what confidence could they have rallied them as they did, for worſhipping gods which their own *Hands* had made? That had neither *Voice*, nor *Life*, nor *Motion*; Expoſed to *Age*, to *Corruption*, to *Duſt*, to *Worms*, to *Fire*, and other *Accidents*. That they adored gods which their Enemies could ſpoil them of, Thieves and Robbers take from them; which having no power to defend themſelves, were forced to be kept under *Locks* and *Bolts* to ſecure them.

So Juſtin Martyr. Apol. 2. Tertul. Apolog. cap. 12. Arnobius, lib. 1. Minutius Felix. p. 26. Octav. Julius Firmicus, pag. 37. Edit. Lugdunenſ. 4*to*, 1652. Hieron. lib. 12. in Eſai. S. Auguſtinus in Pſal. 80. & in Pſal. 113. Lactantius Inſtit. lib. 2. cap. 4. Chryſoſtom. Homil. 57. in Geneſ. *&c.*

For is not the Euchariſtical *Bread* and *Wine*, in a higher degree than any of their *Idols* were, expoſed to the ſame raillery? Had their *Wafer*, if ſuch then was their *Hoſt*, any *voice*, or *life*, or *motion?* Did not their own Hands form its *ſubſtance*, and their *Mouths* ſpeak it into a *God?* Could it defend it ſelf, I do not ſay from publick Enemies, or private Robbers, but even from the very *Vermine*, the creeping things of the Earth?

Or ſhould we ſuppoſe the Chriſtians to have been ſo impudent, as notwithſtanding all this, to expoſe others for the ſame follies of which

themſelves were more notoriouſly guilty; yet were there no * Heathens, that had wit enough to recriminate? The other † *Articles* of our Faith they ſufficiently traduced; That we ſhould worſhip a *Man*, and He a Malefactor, crucified by *Pilate*; How would they have triumph'd, could they have added, That they worſhipped a bit of *Bread* too; which *Coſter* himſelf thought a more ridiculous *Idolatry* than any the Heathens were guilty of? Since this Doctrine has been ſtarted, we have heard of the Reproaches of all ſorts of Men, *Jews*, *Heathens*, *Mahometans*, againſt us on this account. † Were there no *Apoſtates* that could tell them of this ſecret before? not any *Julian* that had malice enough to publiſh their Confuſion? Certainly had the Ancients been the Men they are now endeavour'd to be repreſented, we had long ere this ſeen the whole World filled with the Writings that had proclaimed their ſhame, in one of the greateſt inſtances of Impudence and Inconſideration, to attacque their Enemies for that very Crime, of which themſelves were more notoriouſly guilty.

* And yet that none did, the Learned *Rigaltius* confeſſes. *Not. ad Tertul.* l. 2. *ad Uxor.* c. 5.

† See *Tertul.* Apol. c. 21. Et de carne Chriſti, c. 4, 5. *Juſtin Martyr*, Apol. 2. *Arnob.* l. 2. *Orig. contr. Celſ.* l. 1.

† See *du Perron de l' Euchar.* l. 3. c. 29. p. 973.

V. Nor does their manner of Diſputing againſt the *Heretical* Chriſtians any leſs ſpeak their Opinion in this Point, than their way of Oppoſing the *Idolatry* of the Heathens. It was a great argument amongſt them to expoſe the frenzy of *Eutyches*, who imagined ſome ſuch kind of *Tranſubſtantiation* of the humane nature of Chriſt into the Divine, to produce the Example of the *Euchariſt*;

See this fully handled in a late treatiſe called, *The Doctrine of the Trinity and Tranſubſtantiation compared*, &c. 1687.

Euchariſt; That as there the Bread and the Wine, ſays P. *Gelaſius*, "*Being perfected by the Holy Spirit,* "*paſs into the Divine Subſtance, yet ſo as ſtill to* "*remain in the property of their own Nature, or ſub-* "*ſtance of Bread and Wine*; So here the Humane *Nature* of Chriſt ſtill remains, though aſſumed by, and conjoyned to the *Divine*. Which words, as their *Editor* has done well to ſet a *Cautè* upon in the Margent to ſignifie their danger, ſo this is clear from them, that *Gelaſius*, and ſo the other Writers that have made uſe of the ſame Argument, as St. *Chryſoſtom*, *Theodoret*, &c. muſt have thought the *Bread* and the *Wine* in the *Euchariſt* no more to have been *really* changed into the *very Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt, than they did believe his *Humane Nature* to have been truly *turned* into the *Divine*; For that otherwiſe the parallel would have ſtood them in no ſtead, nay would have afforded a defence of that Hereſie which they undertook to oppoſe by it.

This Argument is managed by St. *Chryſoſtom Epiſt. ad Cæſarium Monachum.* By *Theodoret Dial.* 2. *pag.* 85. *Ed. G. L. Paris*, 1642. *Tom.* 4. *Gelaſius in Opere contra Eutychen & Neſtorium.* He thus ſtates the *Eutychian* Hereſie, '*Dicunt unam eſſe naturam*, i. e. *Divinam.* Againſt this he thus diſputes, *Certe Sacramenta quæ ſumimus corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti divina res eſt.*—— *Et tamen non deſinit ſubſtantia vel Natura Panis & Vini.*——*Satis ergo nobis evidenter oſtenditur, hoc nobis de ipſo Chriſto Domino ſentiendum, quod in ejus* imagine *profitemur.* —— *—Ut ſicut in hanc, ſc. in divinam tranſeant S. Spiritu perficiente ſubſtantiam, permanentes tamen in ſuæ proprietate naturæ, ſic, &c.*

VI. Yet more: Had the Primitive Chriſtians believed this great *Change*; how comes it to paſs, that we find none of thoſe *Marks* nor *Signs* of it, that the World has ſince abounded with? * No talk of *Accidents* exiſting without *Subjects*, of the *Senſes* being liable to

* See the contrary proved, that the Fathers did not believe this, by *Blondel*, del'Euch. c. 8. *Claude* Rep. au 2. Traitte de la *Perpetuite*, part. 1. c. 4.

be

be *deceived* in judging of their proper *Objects*; in ſhort, no *Philoſophy* corrupted to maintain this Paradox. No *Adorations*, *Proceſſions*, *Vows* paid to it, as to Chriſt himſelf. It is but a very little time ſince the † *Bell* came in Play, to give the People notice that they ſhould fall down and Worſhip this new God. The * *Feaſt* in honour of it, is an Invention of Yeſterday; the *Adoring* of it in the *Streets* no † older: had not thoſe firſt Chriſtians reſpect ſufficient for our Bleſſed Saviour? Or, did they perhaps do all this? Let them ſhew it us if they can; But till then, we muſt beg leave to conclude, That ſince we find not the leaſt Footſteps of any of theſe neceſſary Appendages of this Doctrine among the Primitive Chriſtians, it is not to be imagined that we ſhould find the *Opinion* neither.

† Under Greg. ix. Ann. 1240. vid. Nauclerum ad Ann. cit.

* Inſtituted by *Urban* iv. Ann. 1264.

† Indeed, in all Probability, a hundred years later.

VII. But this is not all: We do not only not find any ſuch Proofs as theſe of this Doctrine, but we find other Inſtances directly contrary to this belief. In ſome Churches they † *burnt* what remained of the *Conſecrated Elements*; * In others, they gave it to *little Children* to Eat: † In ſome, they buried it with their *Dead*; In all, they permitted the Communicants to carry home ſome *Remnants* of them; they ſent it abroad by *Sea*, by *Land*, from

† So in that of *Jeruſalem*. See Heſych. in Levitic. l. 2. c. 8.

* So in that of Conſtantinople. Evag. Hiſt. l. 4. c. 35.

† Vid. apud Autor. Vit. Baſilii, c. 8. in Vit. Pat. l. 1. This Cuſtom was condemned in a Council at *Carthage*, Anno 419. Vid. Codic. Eccl. Afric. Juſtel. c. 18.

one

one *Church* and *Village* to another, without any Proviſion of *Bell* or *Taper*, *Canopy* or *Incenſe*, or any other mark of *Adoration*; they ſometimes made † *Poultices* of the *Bread*; they mix'd the * *Wine* with their *Ink*; all which we can never imagine ſuch holy Men would have preſumed to do, had they indeed believed them to be the very *Body* and *Blood* of our Bleſſed Lord.

† Vid. St. Auguſt Oper. imp. contr. Julian. lib. 3. c. 164.

* See an inſtance of this in *Baronius*, Ann. 648. Sect. 15. The 8th General Council did the ſame. In Act. Syn.

VIII. Laſtly, Since the prevalence of this Doctrine in the Church, what *Oppoſition* has it met with? What *Schiſms* has it cauſed? What infinite Debates have there riſen about it? I ſhall not need to ſpeak of the Troubles of *Berenger* in the Eleventh: Of the *Waldenſes*, *Albigenſes*, and others in the Twelfth Century. Of *Wickliff*, *Hus*, &c. who continued the Oppoſition; and finally, of the great *Reformation* in the beginning of the laſt *Age*; by all which this Hereſy has been oppoſed ever ſince it came to any Knowledg in the Church. Now is it poſſible to be believed, that ſo many *Centuries* ſhould paſs, ſo many *Hereſies* ſhould ariſe, and a Doctrine ſo full of Contradictions remain unconteſted in the Church for almoſt a Thouſand years? That *Berenger* ſhould be one of the firſt that ſhould begin to credit his *Senſes*, to conſult his *Reaſon*, or even to defend his *Creed*?

Theſe

Theſe are Improbabilities that will need very convincing Arguments indeed to remove them. But for the little late *French* trick of proving this Doctrine neceſſary to have been received in the *Primitive Church*, becauſe it is ſo in the *Preſent*, and if you will believe them, 'tis impoſſible a *Change* ſhould have been made; I ſuppoſe we need only turn the terms of the Argument to ſhew the Weakneſs of the Proof, *viz.* That from all theſe, and many other Obſervations, that might be offer'd of the like kind, 'tis evident that this *Doctrine* at the beginning, was not believed in the *Church*, and let them from thence ſee, if they can conclude that neither is it believed now.

This is the Foundation of the Authors of the Treatiſes, *De la Perpetuité*: Anſwered by Monſ. *Claude*.

Thus contrary is this Doctrine to the Beſt and Pureſt *Tradition* of the Church: Nor is it leſs, *Secondly*,

II. *To* Right Reaſon *too.*

It were endleſs to heap together all the *contradictions* that might be offer'd to prove this; "That there ſhould be *Length*, and no-"thing *Long*; *Breadth*, and nothing "*Broad*; *Thickneſs*, and nothing *Thick*; "*Whiteneſs*, and nothing *White*; *Round-*"*neſs*, and nothing *Round*; *Weight*, and nothing "*Heavy*; *Sweetneſs*, and nothing *Sweet*; *Moiſture*, "and nothing *Moiſt*; *Fluidneſs*, and nothing *Flow-*"*ing*;

See Mr. *Chillingworth* againſt *Knot*, c. iv. n. 46.

"*ing*; many *Actions* and no *Agent*; many *Paſſi-*
"*ons*, and no *Patient*; i. e. That there ſhould be a
"*Long, Broad, Thick, White, Round, Heavy, Sweet,*
"*Moiſt, Flowing, Active, Paſſive* NOTHING.
"That *Bread* ſhould be turned into the *Subſtance*
"of Chriſt, and yet not any thing of the *Bread*
"become any thing of *Chriſt*; neither the *Mat-*
"*ter*, nor the *Form*, nor the *Accidents of the*
"*Bread*, be made either the *Matter*, or the
"*Form*, or the *Accidents* of *Chriſt*; that *Bread*
"ſhould be turned into *Nothing*, and at the ſame
"Time with the ſame Action turned into *Chriſt*,
"and yet *Chriſt* ſhould not be *Nothing*; that the
"ſame Thing at the ſame Time ſhould have its
"juſt *Dimenſions*, and juſt *Diſtance* of its *Parts*
"one from another, and at the ſame time not
"have it, but all its *Parts* together in one and
"the ſelf-ſame *Point*; That the ſame Thing at
"the ſame time ſhould be wholly *Above* it ſelf,
"and wholly *Below* it ſelf, *Within* it ſelf, and
"*Without* it ſelf, on the *Right-hand*, and on the
"*Left-hand*, and *Round-about* it ſelf: That the
"ſame thing at the ſame time ſhould *move to*
"and *from* it ſelf, and yet *lie ſtill*; or that it
"ſhould be *carried* from one place to another
"through the middle ſpace, and yet not *move*.
"That there ſhould be no *Certainty* in our *Sen-*
"*ſes*, and yet that we ſhould know ſomething
"*certainly*, and yet know nothing but by our
"*Senſes*; That that which *Is* and *Was* long ago,
"ſhould now *begin to be*; That that is now to
"be made of *Nothing*, which is not *Nothing*, but
"*Something*; That the ſame thing ſhould be *Be-*

"*fore* and *After* it ſelf. Theſe and many other "of the like nature are the unavoidable, and "moſt of them the avow'd Conſequences of *Tran-* "*ſubſtantiation*, and I need not ſay, all of them "Contradictions to *Right Reaſon.*

But I ſhall inſiſt rather upon ſuch Inſtances as the Primitive *Fathers* have judged to be *abſurd* and *impoſſible*; and which will at once ſhew both the Falſeneſs and Novelty of this monſtrous Doctrine; and ſuch are theſe; * *That a thing already exiſting ſhould be produced anew*: *That a finite thing ſhould be in many places at the ſame time*; *That a Body ſhould be in a place, and yet take up no room in it*; *That a Body ſhould penetrate the dimenſions of another Body*; *That a Body ſhould exiſt after the manner of a Spirit*; *That a real body ſhould be inviſible and impaſſible*: *That the ſame thing ſhould be it ſelf, and the figure of it ſelf*: *That the ſame thing ſhould be contained in, and participate of it ſelf*; † *That an Accident ſhould exiſt by it ſelf without a Subject, after the manner of a Subſtance.* All theſe things the primitive *Fathers* have declared to be in their Opinions groſs *Abſurdities* and *Contradictions*, without making any exception of the *Divine Power* for the ſake of the *Euchariſt*, as ſome do now.

* See Examples of every one of theſe collected by *Blondel, Eclairciſſements familiers de la controverſe de l'Euchariſtie, cap. 8. p. 253.*

† Monſieur Claude Rep. au 2. Traitte de la Perpetuite, part. 1. c. 4. n. 11. p. 73. Ed. 4to. Paris 1668.

And indeed it were well if the impoſſibilities ſtopp'd here: but alas! the Repugnancies extend to

to the very *Creed* it ſelf, and deſtroy the chiefeſt *Articles* of our *Faith*, the Fundamentals of Chriſtianity. How can that man profeſs that he believes our Saviour Chriſt to have been *born* xvi, Ages ſince, of the *Virgin Mary*, whoſe very *Body* he ſees the Prieſt about to make now before his Eyes? That he believes him to have *Aſcended into Heaven*, and behold he is yet with us upon *Earth?* There to *Sit at the right hand of God the Father Almighty*, till in the end of the World, *He ſhall come again with Glory to judg both the Quick and the Dead*; And behold he is here carried through the Streets; lock'd up in a Box; Adored firſt, and then Eaten by his own Creatures; carried up and down in ſeveral manners, and to ſeveral places, and ſometimes *Loſt out of a Prieſts Pocket.*

Theſe are no far-fetch'd *Conſiderations*; they are the obvious Conſequences of this Belief; and if theſe things are impoſſible, as doubtleſs, if there be any ſuch thing as *Reaſon* in the World, they are; I ſuppoſe it may be very much the concern of every one that profeſſes this Faith, to reflect a little upon them, and think what account muſt one day be given of their perſiſting obſtinately in a point ſo evidently erroneous, that the leaſt degree of an impartial judgment, would preſently have ſhewn them the falſeneſs of it.

But God has not left himſelf without farther witneſs in this matter; but has given us, *Thirdly*,

III. *The Conviction of our* Senſes *againſt it.*

An Argument this, which ſince it cannot be Anſwered, they ſeem reſolved to run it down; as the *Stoick* in *Lucian*, who began to call names, when he had nothing elſe to ſay for himſelf.

But if the *Senſes* are ſuch ill *Informers*, that they may not be truſted in matters of this moment, would theſe Diſputers pleaſe to tell us, What *Authority* they have for the truth of the *Chriſtian Religion?* Was not Chriſtianity firſt founded upon the *Miracles* of our Bleſſed Saviour and his Apoſtles? Or were not the *Senſes* judges of thoſe *Miracles?* Are not the *Incarnation*, *Death*, *Reſurrection* and *Aſcenſion* of our Lord, the moſt Fundamental *Articles* of our Faith? Have we any other Argument to warrant our belief of theſe, but what comes to us by the miniſtry of our *Senſes?* *Did not Chriſt himſelf appeal to them for the proof of his own *Riſing?*

*John XX. 27, 29.

The *Romaniſt* himſelf believes *Tranſubſtantiation*, becauſe he reads in the Scripture, or rather (to ſpeak more agreeably to the method of their Church) becauſe he has been told there are ſuch Words there, as, *Hoc eſt Corpus Meum:* Now not to enquire how far thoſe words will ſerve to warrant this Doctrine, is it not evident that he cannot

cannot be ſure there are any ſuch words there, if he may not truſt his *Senſes*? And if he may, is it not as plain, That he muſt ſeek for ſome other meaning than what they give of them?

Let us ſuppoſe the change they ſpeak of to be ſupernatural; Be it as much a *Miracle* as they deſire; The very Character of a *Miracle* is to be known by the *Senſes*. Nor God, nor Chriſt, nor any Prophet or Apoſtle, ever pretended to any other. And I ſhall leave it to any one to judge what progreſs Chriſtianity would have made in the World, if it had had no other *Miracles* but ſuch as *Tranſubſtantiation* to confirm it: *i. e.* Great Wonders confidently aſſerted, but ſuch as every ones *ſenſe* and *reaſon* would tell him were both falſely aſſerted, and impoſſible to be preformed.

But now whil'ſt we thus oppoſe the Errors of ſome by aſſerting the continuance of the Natural Subſtance of the Elements of *Bread* and *Wine* in this Holy *Euchariſt*; let not any one think that we would therefore ſet up the miſtakes of others; as if this Holy *Sacrament* were nothing more than a meer *Rite* and *Ceremony*, a bare *Commemoration* only of Chriſt's Death and Paſſion.

Our Church indeed teaches us to believe, That the *Bread* and *Wine* continue ſtill in their True and Natural *Subſtance*; but it teaches us alſo

See the Church Catechism, and Article Twenty eight. The Communion-Office, *&c.*

also that 'tis the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ, which every faithful Soul receives in that Holy Supper: *Spiritually* indeed, and after a *Heavenly manner*, but yet most *truly* and *really* too.

The Primitive Fathers, of whom we have before spoken, sufficiently assure us, that they were strangers to that *Corporeal change* that is now pretended; but for this *Divine* and *Mystical*, they have openly enough declared for it.

Nor are we therefore afraid to confess a *change*, and that a very great one too made in this Holy *Sacrament*. The *Bread* and the *Wine* which we here Consecrate, ought not to be given or received by any one in this *Mystery*, as *common* ordinary food. Those Holy Elements which the Prayers of the Church have *sanctified*, and the Divine Words of our Blessed Saviour applied to them, though not *Transubstantiated*, yet certainly separated to a Holy use and signification, ought to be regarded with a very just Honour by us: And whilst we Worship Him whose Death we herein Commemorate, and of whose Grace we expect to be made partakers by it, we ought certainly to pay no little regard to the *Types* and *Figures*, by which he has chosen to represent the *one*, and convey to us the *other*.

Thus therefore we think we shall best divide our Piety, if we *Adore* our Redeemer in *Heaven*, yet omit nothing that may testifie our just esteem of his

his Holy *Sacrament* on *Earth*: Nor ſuffer the moſt Zealous Votary for this new Opinion, to exceed us in our Care and Reverence of Approaching to his Holy Table.

We acknowledg him to be no leſs *Really* Preſent, tho' after another *manner*, than they; nor do we leſs expect to Communicate of his *Body* and *Blood* with our *Souls*, than they who think they take Him carnally into their *Mouths*.

Let our *Office* of *Communion* be examined; let the Reverence and Devotion, with which we Celebrate this Sacred Feaſt, be conſider'd; all theſe will ſhew how far the Church of *England* is from a light eſteem of this great *Myſtery*; indeed, that it is impoſſible for any to ſet a higher Value and Reverence upon it.

I ſhall cloſe this with the Declaration of One, who after many Years ſpent in great Reputation in their *Communion*, was ſo happy as to finiſh his Days in our *Church*; upon his firſt receiving the Bleſſed *Communion* among us: "* *Tantam magnorum Præſulum de-*
"*miſſionem, tam eximiam Principum &*
"*Populi Reverentiam, in Sacra Eucha-*
"*riſtia adminiſtranda & recipienda, nuſ-*
"*quam ego vidi apud Romanenſes, qui tamen*
"*ſe unos Sacramenti iſtius cultores jactant.* That He never ſaw in the *Church* of *Rome*, ſo great a Reverence both in *Adminiſtring* and *Receiving* this Holy *Euchariſt*, as he found among us; inſo-

* Andr. Sallii Votum pro pace, c. 23. p. 90. Ed. Oxon. 1678.

insomuch, that he supposed it would hardly be believed among them, what from his own Experience he recounted concerning it.

Porro hæc quæ narravi & trita nimis ac vulgo nota videbuntur fratribus nostris Reformatæ Ecclesiæ: Nova omnino & forte incredibilia apparebunt Romanæ Congregationis Alumnis; quorum scilicet *auribus perpetuò suggeritur per suos Instructores, nullam apud Protestantes existere fidem præsentiæ Christi realis in Eucharistiæ Sacramento, nullam Devotionem aut Reverentiam in eo sumendo.*

Vid. ibid. pag. 90. cap. XXIV. n. 7.

And this may suffice for the *first* thing proposed, Of the *Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation*, or of the *Real Presence* professed and established in the *Church of Rome*. Our next Business will be to inquire

II. What that *Real Presence* of Christ in this Holy *Eucharist* is, which is acknowledged by the *Church of England*.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of the Real Preſence *acknowledged by the* Church *of* England.

IT may ſufficiently appear from what has been ſaid in the foregoing Chapter, what juſt reaſon we have to reject that kind of *Preſence* which the *Church* of *Rome* ſuppoſes of Chriſt in this *Holy Euchariſt*. But now in Anſwer to our Reflections upon them on this Occaſion, a late Author has thought fit to make the World believe, that we our ſelves, in our Opinion of the *Real Preſence*, are altogether as abſurd as they are; and that the ſame Exceptions lie againſt our own *Church*, which we urge againſt *theirs*: All which, if it were true, would but little mend the Matter, unleſs it may be thought ſufficient for a Man to prove, that he is not mad himſelf, becauſe moſt of his Neighbours are in the ſame Condition. Indeed herein he muſt be allowed to have Reaſon on his Side, that if the Caſe be ſo as he affirms, we, of all Men living, ought not to preſs them with ſuch *Contradictions*, as our own Opinion ſtands equally involved in.

Two Diſcourſes concerning the Adoration of our B. Saviour in the Euchariſt. Oxford. 1687.

Tract. I. pag. 15, 16.

'Tis true, he confeſſes for what concerns the *Church* of *England*, as it ſtood in the latter * end of King *Edward* the *6th*'s Time, and as it may perhaps be thought to ſtand now, ſince the † *reviving* of the *Old Rubrick* againſt the *Adoration* of the *Sacrament* at the end of our *Communion-Office*; it ſeems not to lye open to ſuch a Recrimination: But taking our Opinion of the *Real Preſence* from the Expreſſions of our own *Di-*

* Tract. I. §. 26.

† Ibid. §. 4.

vines, and of thoſe abroad, ſuch as *Calvin*, &c. whoſe "Doctrine, amongſt all the reſt, the *Church* of *England* "ſeems rather to have embraced and agreed with, eſ- "pecially ſince the beginning of the *Reformation* by "Q. *Elizabeth*; it plainly implies, "*That the very Sub-* "*ſtance of Chriſt's Body*; *That his Natural Body, that* "*very Body that was born of the Bleſſed Virgin, and cru-* "*cified on the Croſs, is preſent as in Heaven, ſo here in* "*this Holy Sacrament, either to the worthy Receiver, or to* "*the Symbols*: which not only contradicts the preſent Declaration of our Church; *viz.* "That *the Natural* "*Body of Chriſt is not in this Bleſſed Sacrament*; but will alſo lay a neceſſity upon us to quit our Reaſon too that we give for it; *viz.* "*That it is againſt the Truth of a* "*Natural Body to be in more places than One at One time*; and on which we ſeem to found our Faith in this Matter.

This is, I think, the deſign of the former of thoſe Diſcourſes lately Printed at *Oxford*, as to what concerns the Real Preſence; and in Anſwer to which, that I may proceed as diſtinctly as poſſible, I ſhall reduce my Reflections to theſe Four Generals:

1. What is the true Notion of the *Real Preſence*, as acknowledged by the *Church* of *England*.

2. That this has been the Notion conſtantly maintain'd by the Generality of our Divines.

3. That the *Alteration* of the *Rubrick*, as to this matter, was not upon any ſuch difference in their Opinions, as this *Author* ſeems to ſurmiſe.

4. That the Reaſon alledged by it, concerning the Impoſſibility of Chriſt's *Natural Body*'s exiſting in

ſ.-

ſeveral Places at the ſame Time, is no way invalidated by any of his Exceptions againſt it.

But before I enter on theſe *Reflections*, I cannot but obſerve the unreaſonableneſs of our Adverſaries, in repeating continually the ſame Arguments againſt us without either adding of any the leaſt new force to them, or even taking notice of thoſe Replies that have more than once been made againſt them. The *Publiſher* of this *Treatiſe* has not been ſo indiligent an Obſerver of what has paſt under his Eyes, with reference to theſe kind of *Controverſies*, as not to know, that this very *Objection*, which is the Foundation of his *Firſt Diſcourſe*, was made by his Old Friend *T. G.* above Nine Years ſince; and fully anſwer'd by his Reverend and Learned *Adverſary* not long after. And therefore that he certainly ought either quietly to have let alone this Argument already baffled, and not have put the World in Mind where that Debate ſtopp'd; or, at leaſt, he ſhould have added ſome new ſtrength to it. But to ſend it again into the World in the ſame forlorn State it was before; to take no notice either from whoſe Store-houſe he borrow'd it, or what had been returned to it; This is in effect to confeſs, that they have no more to ſay for themſelves: And 'tis a ſad Cauſe indeed that has nothing to keep it up, but what they know very well we can anſwer, and that they themſelves are unable to defend.

But to return to the *Points* propoſed to be conſider'd: And,

Firſt, To ſtate the Notion of the *Real Preſence*, as acknowledged by the *Church* of *England*.

I muſt obſerve, 1*ſt*. That our *Church* utterly denies our Saviour's *Body* to be ſo *Really Preſent* in the Bleſſed *Sacrament*, as either to leave *Heaven*, or to exiſt in *ſeveral places at the ſame time*. We confeſs, with this Author, that it would be no leſs a Contradiction for Chriſt's *Natural Body*, to be in ſeveral Places at the ſame Time by any other *Mode* whatſoever, than by that which the *Church* of *Rome* has ſtated; the repugnancy being in the *Thing it ſelf*, and not in the *Manner of it*. 2*dly*, That we deny that in the Sacred *Elements* which we receive, there is any other *Subſtance* than that of *Bread* and *Wine*, diſtributed to the Communicants; which alone they take into their Mouths, and preſs with their Teeth. In ſhort, "All which the "Doctrine of our *Church* implies by this Phraſe, is "only a *Real Preſence* of Chriſt's Inviſible *Power* and "*Grace*, ſo in and with the *Elements*, as by the faith-"ful receiving of them, to convey *ſpiritual* and *real* "*Effects* to the Souls of Men. As the *Bodies* aſſu-"med by Angels, might be called their *Bodies*, while "they aſſumed them; or rather, as the *Church* is the "*Body* of Chriſt, becauſe of his Spirit quickening and "enlivening the Souls of Believers, ſo the *Bread* and "*Wine*, after *Conſecration*, are the *Real*, but the *Spiri-*"*tual* and *Myſtical Body* of Chriſt.

1. Tract. p. 19. §. 27.

Anſwer to T. G's Dialogues. Lond. 1679. pag. 66.

Thus has that Learned Man, to whom *T. G.* firſt made this Objection, ſtated the Notion of the *Real Preſence* profeſs'd by us; and that this is indeed the true *Doctrine* of the *Church* of *England* in this Matter, is evident not only from the plain Words of our *xxviii. Article*, and of our *Church Catechiſm*; but alſo from the whole Tenour of that *Office* which we uſe in the Celebration of it. In our *Exhortation* to it, this Bleſſed Euchariſt is expreſly called "The *Commu-*

"*nion*

"*nion* of the *Body* and *Blood* of our Saviour Christ: We are told, "That if with a true Penitent Heart "and lively Faith we receive this Holy Sacrament; "then we *Spiritually eat* the *Flesh* of Christ, and *drink* "his *Blood*. When the Priest delivers the Consecrated *Bread*, he bids the Communicant "Take and eat this "in Remembrance that Christ died for thee, and *feed* "on him in thy *Heart* by Faith with Thanksgiving. In our Prayer after the Receiving, "We thank God, "for that he doth vouchsafe to feed us who have duly "received these Holy *Mysteries*, with the *Spiritual* "Food of the most precious *Body* and *Blood* of his "Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, and doth assure us "thereby of his Favour and Goodness towards us, and "that we are very Members, incorporate in the *Mystical* "*Body* of his Son. All which, and many other the like Expressions, clearly shew, that the *Real Presence* which we confess in this Holy *Eucharist* is no other than in St. *Paul*'s Phrase a *Real Communion* of Christ's *Body* and *Blood*; or as our Church expresses it *Article* xxviii. "That to such as rightly and worthily, and with Faith "receive the same, the *Bread* which we break is a par-"taking of the *Body* of Christ, and likewise the *Cup of* "*Blessing* is a partaking of the *Blood* of Christ.

Hence it was that in the Prayer of *Consecration* in King *Edward* vi. Time, the *Church* of *England* after the Example of the ancient *Liturgies* of the *Greek Church* used that Form, which our Author observes to have been since left out. "And with thy Holy Spirit vouch- Tract. I. §. 2. "safe to Bless and Sanctifie these thy Gifts and Crea-"tures of *Bread* and *Wine*, that they may be unto us "the *Body* and *Blood* of thy most dearly Beloved Son "Jesus Christ—*i. e.* as the Sense plainly implies, may Communicate to our Souls all the Blessings and Gra-

ces

ces which Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood* has purchaſed for us; which is in Effect the very ſame we now pray for in the ſame Addreſs—"Hear us, O Merciful Fa-"ther, we moſt humbly beſeech thee, and grant that we "receiving theſe thy Creatures of *Bread* and *Wine*, ac-"cording to thy Son our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt's Holy In-"ſtitution, in remembrance of his Death and Paſſion, "may be *partakers* of his moſt Bleſſed *Body* and *Blood*. Between which two Petitions there is ſo near an Affinity, that had not our Author been very deſirous to find out *Myſteries* where there are indeed none; He would hardly have ſuffer'd his *Puritan* Friend to have lead him to make ſo *heavy a Complaint*, about ſo ſmall a Variation.

Pag. 3.

I will not deny but that ſome Men may poſſibly have advanced their *private Notions* beyond what is here ſaid: But this is I am ſure all that our *Church* warrants, or that we are therefore concern'd to defend. And if there be indeed any, who as our Author here expreſſes it, do believe Chriſt's *Natural Body* to be as in *Heaven*, ſo in the Holy *Sacrament*; they may pleaſe to conſider how this can be reconciled with the *Rubrick* of our *Church*, "That the Natural *Body* and *Blood* of our Saviour Chriſt "are in *Heaven* and not *here*, it being againſt the Truth "of Chriſt's *Natural Body*, to be at one Time in *more* "*Places* than *One*.

In the mean while, I paſs on to the next Thing I propos'd,

Secondly, To ſhew in Oppoſition to the Pretences of our *Adverſary*, that this has been the *Notion* of the *Real Preſence* conſtantly maintain'd by our moſt Learned and Orthodox Divines.

And

And here, becauſe our *Author* has thought fit to appeal not only to our own, but to the foreign Divines for this new Faith which he is pleas'd to impoſe upon us, *viz.* "That the very Subſtance of Chriſt's *Body*, "that his *Natural Body*, that that very *Body* that was "born of the Bleſſed Virgin, and crucified on the Croſs, "*&c.* is preſent, as in *Heaven*, ſo *Here* in this Holy "*Sacrament*; *i. e.* in both at the ſame Time: I muſt be content to follow his Steps, and enquire into the Doctrine firſt of Mr. *Calvin* and his Followers; next of our own Country-men in this Particular. Tract. I. §. 7.

And firſt for Mr. *Calvin*, and his Followers, I cannot but obſerve what different Charges are brought againſt them in this Matter. On the one Hand we are told by *Becanus* the *Jeſuit*, that, "* The *Calviniſts*, *ſays* "*he*, deny the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt to be *truly*, "*really*, and *ſubſtantially* preſent in the *Euchariſt*: On the other, Here is one will prove, that they believe his *very Body*, his *natural Body*, now in Heaven, to be nevertheleſs at the ſame time in the *Holy Sacrament*. It were to be wiſh'd that they would let us once know what 'tis they will ſtick to, and not by ſuch contrary Charges ſhew to all the World, that both their *Accuſations* may be *falſe*, but that it is utterly impoſſible they ſhould both be *true*.

* Calviniſtæ negant corpus & ſanguinem Chriſti, vere, realiter, & ſubſtantialiter præſentem eſſe in Euchariſtiâ. Becani manuale. l. 3. c. 9. p. 501. Ed. Luxembergi. 1625.

And indeed in this very Inſtance they are both falſe; The *Calviniſts* hold neither the one or other of theſe Extreams. In the Edition of his *Inſtitutions* Printed at *Baſil* 1536. Mr. *Calvin* thus deliver'd his Opinion, of the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt in the Holy *Euchariſt*. "We ſay, that they are *Truly* and *Effica-*

CALVIN.

Dicimus verè & Efficaciter exhibere non autem naturaliter. Quo ſcil. ſignificamus non ſubſtantiam ipſam corporis, ſeu verum & naturale Chriſti corpus illic dari, ſed omnia quæ in ſuo corpore nobis beneficia Chriſtus præſtitit. *EA eſt corporis* PRESENTIA *quam Sacramenti ratio poſtulat.* Edit. Baſil. 8°. 1536.

cioufly

" *cionſly* exhibited to us, but not *naturally*: By which we " ſignifie, not that the *very Subſtance* of his *Body*, or that " the *true* and *natural Body* of Chriſt are given there, " but all the *Benefits* which Chriſt did for us in his *Body*. " THIS is that *PRESENCE* of his *Body*, " which the nature of the *Sacrament* requires.

But becauſe I do not find theſe Words in the *Editions* of that Book ſince, leaſt any one ſhould thereupon conclude that he had alſo changed his Opinion; we may obſerve the very ſame delivered by him in * another of his Books, and which will be ſo much the more conſiderable, in that it was written purpoſely for the clearing of this Matter. Now in this he affirms, " † That " Chriſt's *Body* was not only once given for our Salva- " tion, but is alſo every Day reached out to us for our " Suſtenance, that ſo, whilſt he dwells in us, we may " alſo enjoy the Fellowſhip of all his Goods.—Then he explains How Chriſt is our *Food*, *viz.* ‖ becauſe " by the incomprehenſible Vertue of the *Holy Spirit*, " he inſpires his Life into us, that he may communi- " cate it to us, no leſs than the vital Juice is diffuſed " from the Root into all the Branches of the Tree, or " than Vigour flows from the *Head* into all the Mem- bers.—He declares Chriſt's *Body* to be *finite*, and en-

* Dilucida explicatio, &c. Contra Weſtphalum. Edit. Anno 1561.

† Chriſti corpus non modò ſemel fuiſſe datum in ſalutem noſtram, dum ad expianda peccata immolatum in cruce fuit, ſed quotidiè nobis in alimentum porrigi, ut dum ipſe habitat in nobis, bonorum etiam ejus omnium ſocietate fruamur.—Apud Hoſpin. Hiſt. Sacram. Part 2da Ann. 1561. p. 477.

‖ Rurſum alimentum à nobis vocatur hoc ſenſu, quia incomprehenſibili ſpiritûs Virtute nobis vitam ſuam inſpirat ut ſit nobis communis, non ſecus atque à radice arboris vitalis ſuccus in ramos ſe diffundit, vel à capite in ſingula membra manat Vigor. Ibid.——Imprimis obſtaculum de corporis immenſitate ſubmovere neceſſe eſt. Niſi enim conſtet finitum eſſe cælóque comprendi nulla erit diſſidii conciliandi Ratio——— p. 478. Chriſtus ſicuti in gloriam cæleſtem ſemel eſt receptus ita locorum intervallo quoad *carnem*, eſt à nobis diſſitus; *Divinâ* autem *Eſſentiâ* & *virtute*, *gratiâ* etiam *ſpirituali* cœlum & terram implere.—— Idem ergo Corpus quod ſemel filius Dei Patri in ſacrificium obtulit, quotidie nobis in Cœna offert, ut ſit in Spirituale Alimentum. Tantùm de modo tenendum eſt, non opus eſſe deſcendere *carnis Eſſentiam* è cælo ut eâ paſcamur, ſed ad penetranda impedimenta & ſuperandam locorum diſtantiam ſufficere *Spiritûs virtutem*.——Commenta procul faceſſant; qualia ſunt de Corporis *ubiquitate*, vel de occultâ ſub panis ſymbolo *incluſione*, vel de *ſubſtantiali ejus in terris præſentiâ*. *Hoſpin.* p. 478. Hæc omnia refert ex illo *Calvini* loco.

cloſed

" cloſed in *Heaven*; and therefore as to his *Fleſh* to " be diſtant in place from us.——That it is not neceſſary " that the Eſſence of his *Fleſh* ſhould *deſcend* from " *Heaven*, that we may be fed with it, but that to re- " move all ſuch Impediments, and overcome the di- " ſtance of places, the *Virtue* of the *Spirit* is ſufficient.— " In ſhort, that all *inventions* contrary to this are to be " rejected, ſuch as, The *Ubiquity* of Chriſt's Body, " the *incloſing* of it under the *Symbol* of *Bread*, and his " *ſubſtantial Preſence upon Earth.*

By all which it ſufficiently appears, that Mr. *Calvin* was no Friend to our Author's Fancy; but evidently explained the *Real Preſence* after that *ſpiritual* manner we have before laid down.

For *Beza*, and the reſt as he calls them, *of the ſame Sect*; we cannot better learn their Opinion than from the *Acts* of the *Colloquy* of *Poiſſy*, and which chiefly lay upon this *Point*. At this *Conference* the moſt eminent Men of the *Calvinian* Party were aſſembled; the firſt of them which ſpoke, was *Beza*: In that part of his Diſcourſe which referr'd to the *Holy Euchariſt*, his words were much like thoſe which our Author has quoted out of him. And by his own *Expoſition* of them, we ſhall be better able to judg of his meaning, than by his *Adverſary's Gloſs*. " * We do not ſay that

BEZA.

* See *Hoſpin.* Hiſt. Sacram. Part. 2. ad Ann. 1561. p. 515. Edit. Genev. 1681. Comment. de ſtatu Relig. & Reipub. in Galliâ ad Ann. 1561. p. 112. *Et poſtea* pag. 138. ita ſe exprimit in eundem planè ſenſum " affirmamus *J. C.* adeſſe in uſu Cœnæ, in quâ nobis offert, dat & verè exhibet Corpus ſuum & ſanguinem ſuum operatione Spiritus Sancti nos verò recipimus, edimus & bibimus ſpiritualiter & per fidem illud ipſum corpus quod pro nobis mortuum eſt, cúmq; illum ſanguinem pro nobis effuſum. Edit. Ann. 1577. 8°. Beze. Hiſt. Eccleſ. pag. 595, 596.

For all this ſee *Beza*'s own Hiſtory, ad Ann. 1561. p. 524. And when in the Conference *D' Eſpenſe* preſſed them with departing from *Calvin*; *Beza* declared, That they were not at all contrary to him: That for the word *Subſtance*, which he ſometimes uſed in expreſſing Chriſt's *Real Preſence*, it was only to ſignify, that they did not feign any *imaginary Body* of Chriſt, or *fantaſtick Reception* or *Communion* of His *Body* in this Holy Supper: But that for the reſt, they all believed, that no one could participate of him otherwiſe than *Spiritually* and by *Faith*, not in taking Him into the Mouth, or eating him with the Teeth. See pag. 599. *Ibid.*

" in the Euchariſt there is only a *commemoration* of the " death of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; nor do we ſay, that " in it we are made *partakers* only of the *fruits* of " his *death* and *paſſion*; but we join the *ground* with " the *fruits*, affirming, with St. *Paul*, that the *Bread* " which by God's appointment we break, is the *parti-* " *cipation of the Body of Chriſt* crucified for us; the " *Cup* which we drink, the *Communion of the true Blood* " that was ſhed for us; and that *in the very ſame Sub-* " *ſtance which he received in the Womb of the Virgin,* " *and which he carry'd up with him into the Heavens*—— Then deſcending to the *Popiſh* Doctrine of *Tranſub-* *ſtantiation*: " It overthrows, *ſays he*, the *truth* of " Chriſt's *Humane Nature*, and of his Aſcenſion—So little did he ſuppoſe, that Chriſt's *natural Body* could be at the ſame time both in *Heaven* and in the *Sacrament*. Hereupon he explains himſelf yet farther;——" But " now if any one ſhould ask of us, Whether we make " Chriſt *abſent* from the *Holy Supper?* We anſwer, " By no means. But yet if we reſpect the *diſtance* of " *place*, (as when we ſpeak of his *Corporal preſence*, and " of his *Humanity*, we muſt) we affirm, *ſays he*, that " Chriſt's *Body* is as far diſtant from the *Bread* and " *Wine*, as *Heaven* is from *Earth*——If any one ſhall " from thence conclude, that we make Chriſt *abſent* " from the *Holy Supper*, he will conclude amiſs: For " this Honour we allow to God, that though the *Body* " of Jeſus Chriſt be now in *Heaven*, and *not elſewhere*, " and we on *Earth* and *not elſewhere*, yet are we made " *partakers* of his *Body* and *Blood* after a *ſpiritual man-* " *ner*, and by the means of *Faith*.

Thus do's *Beza* in like manner expound their Doctrine of the *Real Preſence*, by a *real Communion* of Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood*, and flatly condemns our Authors

thor's invention, of his *natural Body*'s being either in the *Symbols*, or any where elſe upon *Earth*. The ſame is the account which † *Peter Martyr* in the ſame *Conference* gave of it; and of whom * *Eſpenſius*, one of the *Popiſh* Delegates, confeſs'd, "That no Di-"vine of that time had ſpoken "ſo clearly and diſtinctly con-"cerning this *Sacrament*, as he "did. And however ‖ *Genebrard* falſly pretends that the other *Proteſtants* diſſented from him, yet 'tis certain they were ſo far from it, that they all ſubſcribed the very ſame Paper out of which he read his Declaration. But I will cloſe this with the ſame words with which theſe *Proteſtants* did their final reſolution in the *Colloquy* as to this matter; "We "affirm that no *diſtance* of *place* can hinder the *Com-*"*munion* which we have with Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood*; "becauſe the Supper of the Lord is a Heavenly Thing, "and though upon Earth we receive with our Mouths "*Bread* and *Wine*, *viz.* the true *Symbols* of his *Body* "and *Blood*; yet by *Faith*, and through the Opera-"tion of the *Holy Spirit*, our Souls (of which this is

PETER MARTYR.

† Reſpondeo pro meâ parte, Corpus Chriſti non eſſe *Verè* & *Subſtantialiter* alibi quàm in Cœlo. Non tamen inficior Chriſti corpus verum, & ſanguinem illius Verum quæ pro ſalute humana trædita ſunt in Cruce, fide ſpiritualiter percipi in Sacrâ Cœnâ. Hiſtoire Eccleſ. de Beze. liv. 4. p. 606. Anno 1561.

* Vid. Hiſt. de Beze ib. p. 599. Comment. de ſtat. rel. p. 140. ad Ann. 1561. *Hoſpin.* p. 518.

‖ See *Hoſpin.* of this whole matter, pag. 520.

Affirmamus nullam locorum diſtantiam impedire poſſe communicationem quam habemus cum Chriſti corpore & ſanguine quoniam Cœna Domini eſt res Cœleſtis; & quamvis in terrâ recipiamus ore panem & vinum, vera ſcil. Corporis & ſanguinis ſigna; tamen fide & ſpiritûs ſancti operatione mentes noſtræ (quarum hic eſt præcipuè cibus) in cœlum elatæ perfruuntur corpore & ſanguine præſente. Et hoc reſpectu dicimus, Corpus verè ſe pani conjungere, & ſanguinem vino; non aliter tamen quam *ſacramentali ratione*, neque *locali* neque *naturali modo*, ſed quoniam Efficaciter ſignificant Deum illa dare fideliter communicantibus, illoſq; fide verè & certo percipere. *Hoſpin.* l. c. Comm. ibid. p. 142. *Ubi ſubjicitur*, "Hæc eſt perſpicua de Corporis & ſanguinis *J.C.* Præſentia in Sacramento Cœnæ Eccleſiarum Reformatarum ſententia——*Beze* Hiſt. Eccleſ. pag. 615. *where he adds*, That they reject not only *Tranſubſtantiation*, and *Conſubſtantiation*, but alſo toute maniere de preſence par laquelle le corps de Chriſt n'eſt colloquè maintenant reellement ailleurs qu'au ciel. *And then adds*, Why they thus uſe the word Subſtance in this matter, and what they mean by it. See pag. 615. ad Ann. 1561.

"the chief food) being carried up into Heaven, en-
"joy the *Body* and *Blood* preſent. And in this reſpect
"we ſay, that the *Body* do's truly joyn its ſelf to the
"*Bread*, and the *Blood* to the *Wine*, but yet no other-
"wiſe than *Sacramentally*, neither after a *local* or *natural*
"*manner*. But becauſe they do effectually ſignify,
"that God gives them to the Faithful Communicants,
"and that they do by Faith truly and certainly receive
"them.

And thus far I have conſider'd the Foreign Divines produced by our *Author*, and in which we find the very ſame Explication which our *Church* gives of the *Real Preſence*. For our own Authors, I ſhall inſiſt the rather upon them, both to take off any impreſſion which the Scraps here put together by thoſe whoſe buſineſs it is to repreſent their *own Sence*, not their *Authors*, might otherwiſe be apt to make upon ſome Men; and alſo to ſhew the exact concord there has been ever ſince the *Reformation* amongſt us as to this matter.

Now for what concerns our *Divines* in King *Edward* the Sixth's Time, we have our Author's own confeſſion, That towards the latter end of the Reign of that excellent Prince, they ſeem to have deny'd any ſuch *Real* and *Eſſential Preſence* as he would faſten upon thoſe of Queen *Elizabeth*'s after. "For as the firſt
I. Treatiſe §. xxvi. pag. 19. "days of this Prince, *ſays he*, ſeem to have been more
"addicted to *Lutheraniſm*, ſo the latter days to *Zwin-*
"*glianiſm*; as appears in ſeveral Expreſſions of Bi-
"ſhop *Ridley* and *Peter Martyr*. And indeed the *Ar-*
ticles agreed upon in the *Convocation* at *London*, 1562, plainly ſhew it; in the xxix*th* of which, we find this expreſs Clauſe; "Since the very Being of Humane
"*Nature* doth require that the *Body* of one and the
"ſame

"ſame Man cannot be at one and the ſame time in "*many places*, but of neceſſity muſt be in ſome cer- "tain and determinate *Place*; Therefore the *Body* of "*Chriſt* cannot be preſent in *many* different *places* at "the ſame time. And ſince, as the Holy Scriptures te- "ſtify, Chriſt hath been taken up into *Heaven*, and "there is to abide till the end of the World, it be- "cometh not any of the Faithful to believe or profeſs, "that there is a *Real* or *Corporal Preſence*, as they "phraſe it, of the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt in the "*Holy Euchariſt*. I ſhall therefore produce only a Witneſs or two of this *King*'s Reign, and ſo paſs on to thoſe that follow.

A.B. *CRANMER.*

And 1*ſt*, A. B. *Cranmer*, in his Anſwer to *Gardiner* Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, objecting to him, That he deni'd the *Preſence* of Chriſt in this Holy *Euchariſt*; replies, That it was "a thing he never ſaid not thought. "—My Book in divers places ſaith clean contrary, "That Chriſt is with us *ſpiritually preſent*; is eaten and "drunken of us, and dwelleth within us, although "*Corporally* he be departed out of this World, and "gone into *Heaven*, pag. 5.——As he giveth *Bread* "to be *eaten* with our *Mouths*, ſo giveth he his very "*Body* to be *eaten* with our *Faith*. And therefore I "ſay, that Chriſt giveth himſelf *truly* to be *eaten*, "*chawed* and *digeſted*; but all is *ſpiritually* with *Faith*, "not with *Mouth*, pag. 9.——As the waſhing out- "wardly in Water is not a vain Token, but teacheth "ſuch a waſhing as God worketh inwardly in them "that duly receive the ſame; ſo likewiſe is not the "*Bread* a vain Token, but ſheweth and preacheth to "the godly Receiver, what God worketh in him by "his Almighty Power ſecretly and inviſibly. And "there-

Anſwer to *Gardiner* Biſhop of *Wincheſter*. Fol. *London*, 1551.

Pag. 5.

Pag. 9.

" therefore as the *Bread* is outwardly *eaten indeed* in " the Lord's Supper, ſo is the *very Body* of Chriſt *in-* " *wardly* by *Faith eaten indeed* of all them that come " thereto in ſuch ſort as they ought to do; which " eating nouriſheth them unto Everlaſting Life. And in his Treatiſe of the *Holy Sacrament*, Lib. 3. where he ſets himſelf particularly to ſtate this very Queſtion, *How Chriſt is preſent in this Holy Sacrament?* He declares, *Chap.* 2. " That whereas the *Papiſts* ſuppoſe " Chriſt to be under the *Species* of *Bread* and *Wine*; " we believe him to be in thoſe who worthily re- " ceive theſe Holy *Elements*. They think him to be " received by the *Mouth*, and to enter with the *Bread* " and *Wine*; We aſſert, that he is received only by " the *Soul*, and enters there by *Faith*. That Chriſt is " preſent only *ſacramentally* and *ſpiritually* in this Sa- " cred *Myſtery*, p. 116. That ſince his *Aſcenſion* into " *Heaven*, he is *there*, and not on *Earth*, p. 118. and " that he cannot be in both together, *p.* 128. — In " ſhort, he gives us this Rule for interpreting the Ex- " preſſions of *the Fathers*, where it is ſaid, That we " eat the *Fleſh*, and *drink the Blood* of *Chriſt*; That " we receive in the Holy Sacrament, the *very Body* " that hung on the *Croſs*, &c. *Cap.* 14. *p.* 180. Theſe, " *ſays he*, and other Expreſſions of the like kind, (which " ſpeak Chriſt to be upon *Earth*, and to be received " of Chriſtians by *eating* or *drinking*), are either to be " underſtood of his *Divine Nature* (which is every- " where); or elſe muſt be taken *figuratively* or *ſpiri-* " *tually*. For he is *figuratively* only in the *Bread* and " *Wine*; and *ſpiritually* in thoſe that receive this *Bread* " and *Wine worthily*. But *truly*, and as to his *Body* " and *Fleſh*, he is in *Heaven only*; from whence he ſhall " come to judg the Quick and the Dead.

Aſſertio veræ & Catholicæ Doctrinæ de Sacramento Corporis & Sanguinis, J. Chriſti Servatoris noſtri, *Liche*, 8vo. 1601.

Thus

Thus did this Learned and Holy *Martyr* underſtand our Doctrine of the *Real Preſence*; and the ſame was the *Idea* which his Companion both in *Doctrine* and *Suffering*, Biſhop *Ridley*, has left us of it. In his Diſcourſe of the *Lord's Supper*, pag. 33. he tell us, "That "the *Subſtance* of the *Bread* continues as the Matter of "this Sacrament; but ſo, that by reaſon of its change, "as to *Uſe*, *Office*, and *Dignity*, it is turned *Sacramen-* "*tally* into the *Body* of Chriſt; as in *Baptiſm*, the *Wa-* "*ter* is turned into the *Laver* of *Regeneration*.——That "the *Humane Nature* of Chriſt is in *Heaven*, and can- "not in *any manner* lie hid under the form of *Bread*, "p. 34.——Then he enquires, Whether therefore we "take away the *Preſence* of Chriſt's *Body* from the *Sa-* "*crament?* p. 35. And utterly denies, that this is ei- "ther ſaid or thought by him. The *Subſtance* of the "true *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt, *ſays he*, is always in "*Heaven*, nor ſhall it depart thence before the end of "the World. Now this *Subſtance* of his *Body* and "*Blood* being conjoined to his Divine Nature, has "not only Life in it ſelf, but can, and is wont to be- "ſtow it upon all thoſe who partake of it, and believe "in his Name.—Nor is it any hinderance to this, that "Chriſt *ſtill* remains in *Heaven*, and that we are upon "*Earth*. For by *Grace*, that is, *Life*, (as S. *John* in- "terprets it, *ch.* 6.) and the Properties of it, as far as "may be profitable to us in this our Pilgrimage here "below, he is with us to the end of the World. As "the *Sun*, who though he never leaves his *Orb*, yet "by his *Life*, *Heat*, and *Influence*, is *preſent* to us, *pag.* 36, 37.

Bp. *RIDLEY.*

Ridlii de Cœnâ Dominicâ Aſſertio; *Genevæ* apud *Jo. Criſpinum.* 1556.

Hitherto then there can be no doubt, but that both the *Church* and the *Divines* knew no other *Real Preſence* than what has been before acknowledged to be

be ſtill our *Doctrine.* We muſt now go on to the Times of Trial, the Days of Q. *Elizabeth,* and her Succeſſors, when our Author ſuppoſes, " that Men of diffe-
Tract. 1. §. IV. pag. 4. " rent Judgments had the Power. Now for proof of this, beſides the Expreſſions of particular Men, which we ſhall preſently conſider, we have two General Preſumptions offer'd to us; One, " That Dr. *Heylin,* and " others, have obſerved, *he ſays,* of this Queen, that " ſhe was a *zealous propugner* of the *Real Preſence.* Which may be very true, and yet but little to the purpoſe, if ſhe *propugned* it in the ſame ſenſe that her Brother King *Edward* the *6th,* and the *Church of England* had done before, and not in the new Notion impoſed upon her by this Author, but without any manner of proof to warrant his Suggeſtion. The other, " That
Treatiſe I. pag. 2. §. I. aud again, p. 22. §. XXXI. " upon the Review made by her Divines of the *Com-* " *mon-Prayer* and *Articles,* they ſtruck out of the One " the *Rubrick* againſt the *Adoration* of the *Sacrament,* " and the paſſage before mention'd (being of the ſame " temper as the Declaration in the *Liturgy)* out of the " xxix*th Article*; and which has accordingly been omit- " ted ever ſince.

And here I cannot but again take notice of the diſingenuouſneſs of this Author, in diſſembling the true Account that has ſo largely been given by our late accurate Compiler of the *Hiſtory* of our *Reformation* of this whole matter, only for the advancing ſo pittiful an Inſinuation, of what I dare appeal to his own Conſcience whether he did not know to be otherwiſe. I will beg leave to tranſcribe the whole Paſſage; and ſhall then leave it to the indifferent *Reader* to judg whether a Man ſo well acquainted with Books, and ſo intereſted in this matter, could have lived ſo long in the World without hear-

ing

ing of ſo eminent a matter in our *Church-Hiſtory* as this.

The Author is treating about the Difference between the *Article* eſtabliſh'd in King *Edward* the *Sixth*'s Time, and thoſe in Q. *Elizabeth*'s.

Dr. Burnet's *Hiſtory of the Reformation*, Vol. 2. Pag. 405. Ann. 1559. Edit. 2. 1683.

" In the *Article* of the Lord's Supper there is a great " deal left out; For inſtead of that large Refutation " of the *Corporal Preſence*, from the Impoſſibility of a " *Bodies* being in more Places at once; from whence it " follows, That ſince Chriſt's *Body* is in *Heaven*, the " Faithful ought not to believe or profeſs a *Real* or *Cor-* " *poral Preſence* of it in the Sacrament. In the new " Article it is ſaid, [*That the Body of Chriſt is given* " *and received after a ſpiritual manner; and the means by* " *which it is received, is Faith.*] But in the Original Copy " of theſe *Articles*, which I have ſeen ſubſcribed by the " Hands of *All* that ſate in either Houſe of *Convocation*, " there is a further *Addition* made. The *Articles* were " ſubſcribed with that precaution which was requiſite " in a matter of ſuch Conſequence: For before the *Sub-* " *ſcriptions* there is ſet down the Number of the *Pages*, " and of the *Lines* in every *Page* of the *Book* to which " they ſet their Hands.

MSS. C. Cor. Chriſt. Cant.

In that *Article* of the *Euchariſt* theſe Words are added; " Chriſt when he aſcended into *Heaven* made his *Body* " Immortal, but took not from it the *Nature* of a *Body*: " For ſtill it retains, according to the Scriptures, the " *Verity* of a *Humane Body*; which muſt be always " in *One definite Place*, and cannot be ſpread into ma- " ny, or all Places at Once. Since then Chriſt being " carry'd up to *Heaven*, is to remain there to the end of " the World, and is to come from thence, and from " no Place elſe (as ſays St. *Auſtin*) to judge the Quick " and the Dead; None of the Faithful ought to *be-*

An Explanation of Chriſt's Preſence in the Sacrament.

" *lieve* or *profeſs* the *Real*, or (as they call it) the *Cor-*
" *poral Preſence of his Fleſh and Blood in the Eucha-*
" *riſt.*

" But this in the *Original* is daſh'd over with *minium*;
" yet ſo that it is ſtill legible. The Secret of it was this;
" The *Queen* and her *Council* ſtudied (as hath been al-
" ready ſhewn) to unite all into the *Communion* of
" the *Church*: And it was alledged; that ſuch an ex-
" preſs *Definition* againſt a *Real Preſence*, might drive
" from the *Church* many who were *ſtill* of that *Perſwa-*
" *ſion*; and therefore it was thought to be enough
" to condemn *Tranſubſtantiation*, and to ſay, that
" Chriſt was *preſent* after a *ſpiritual manner*, and re-
" ceived by *Faith*. To ſay more, as it was judged
" ſuperfluous, ſo it might occaſion diviſion. Upon this
" theſe Words were by common conſent left out. And
" in the next *Convocation* the *Articles* were ſubſcribed
" without them; of which I have alſo ſeen the *Ori-*
" *ginal.*

" This ſhews, that the *Doctrine* of the *Church* ſubſcri-
" bed by the whole *Convocation*, was at that time con-
" trary to the belief of a *Real* or *Corporal Preſence* in
" the *Sacrament*; only it was not thought neceſſary or
" expedient to publiſh it. Though from this Silence,
" which flowed not from their *Opinion*, but the *Wiſ-*
" *dom* of that Time, in leaving a Liberty for different
" *Speculations*, as to the *manner* of the *Preſence*; SOME
" have ſince inferr'd, that the chief Paſtors of this
" *Church* did then diſapprove of the *Definition* made in
" King *Edward*'s Time; and that they were for a *Real*
" *Preſence.*

Thus that Learned *Hiſtorian*. And here let our *Adverſary* conſider what he thinks of this Account; and whether after ſo evident a Confutation from plain

mat-

matter of Fact of his Objection before it appear'd we may not reaſonably complain both of his Weakneſs and Inſincerity; neither to take any notice of ſuch a plain Hiſtory of this whole Tranſaction, or to imagine that ſo vain a Surmiſe of Q. *Elizabeth*'s being a great *propugner of the Real Preſence*, would be ſufficient to obviate ſo clear and particular an Account of this matter.

But though this might ſuffice to ſhew the continuance of the ſame *Doctrine* of the *Real Preſence* in this *Queen's*, that was before profeſs'd in her Brother's Reign; yet it may not be amiſs to diſcover a little further the truth of this matter, and how falſly this Author has alledged thoſe great Names he has produced. I will therefore beg leave to continue my Proof, with an Induction of the moſt Eminent of our *Divines* that I have at this time the Opportunity to conſult, to our own days.

Bp. *JEWEL.*

And firſt for Biſhop *Jewel*, though the part he had in the *Convocation* before mention'd, may ſufficiently aſſure us of his Opinion; yet it may not be improper to repeat the very words of a Perſon of his Learning and Eminence in our *Church*. In his Reply to *Harding* thus he expreſſes the *Doctrine* of the *Church* of *England*, as to the *Real Preſence*: "Whereas Mr. "*Harding* thus unjuſtly reporteth of us, that we main- "tain a *naked Figure*, and a *bare Sign* or *Token only*, "and notheng elſe ——He knoweth well, we feed "not the People of God with *bare Signs* and *Figures*, "but teach them, that the *Sacraments* of Chriſt be Ho- "ly *Myſteries*; and that in the Miniſtration thereof "Chriſt is ſet before us even as he was crucified upon "the Croſs. ——We teach the people, not that a "*naked Sign* or *Token*, but that Chriſt's *Body and Blood*

Fifth Article of the Real Preſence *againſt* Harding, *pag.* 237. Lond. 1611. *See alſo his Defence of the Apology of the Church of* England. *pag.* 219, *&c.*

" *indeed and verily* is given unto us; that we *verily eat*
" it; that we *verily drink* it; that we verily be relie-
" ved and live by it: that we are Bones of his Bones,
" and Fleſh of his Fleſh; that Chriſt dwelleth in us, and
" we in him: —— Yet we ſay not, either that the *Sub-*
" *ſtance* of the *Bread* and *Wine* is done away, or that
" Chriſt's *Body* is let down from *Heaven*, or made *Re-*
" *ally* or *Fleſhly preſent* in the *Sacrament*. We are
" taught according to the *Doctrine* of the Old Fathers,
" to *lift* up our Hearts to *Heaven*, and *there* to feed
" upon the Lamb of God——Thus *ſpiritually* and
" with the Mouth of our *Faith* we *eat* the *Body* of
" Chriſt, and *drink* his *Blood*; even as *verily* as his *Bo-*
" *dy* was *verily broken*, and his *Blood verily ſhed* upon
" the *Croſs* —— Indeed the *Bread* that we receive with
" our *Bodily Mouths*, is an *earthly* thing; and therefore
" a *Figure*; as the *Water* in *Baptiſm* is likewiſe alſo a
" *Figure*. But the *Body* if Chriſt that thereby is *repre-*
" *ſented*, and there is *offer'd* unto our *Faith*, is the *Thing*
" *it ſelf*, and not *Figure*. To conclude, Three things
" herein we muſt conſider; 1*ſt*, That we put a diffe-
" rence between the *Sign* and the *Thing* it ſelf that is
" *ſignified*: 2. That we ſeek Chriſt above in *Heaven*,
" and imagine not him to be *preſent Bodily* upon the
" Earth: 3. That the *Body* if Chriſt is to be *eaten* by
" *Faith only*, and none *otherwiſe*.

I ſhall not trouble the Reader with any more of our *Divines* who lived in the begining of this *Queen*'s Reign, and ſubſcribed the *Article* before-recited; but paſs on directly to him whom our Author firſt mentions, the Venerable Mr. *Hooker*, and whoſe Judgment having been ſo deſervedly eſteemed by all ſorts of men, ought not to be lightly accounted of by us.

Mr. *HOOKER.*

Tract. I. cap. 2. §. 10. Pag. 6.

And

And here I must observe, that this Learned Person is drawn in only by a Consequence, and that no very clear one neither, to favour his Opinion, The truth is, he has dealt with Mr, *Hooker* just as himself, or one of his Friends has been observed to have done on the like occasion with the incomparable *Chillingworth*; has pick'd up a Passage or two that seemed for his purpose; but dissembled whole Pages in the same place that were evidently against him. For thus Mr. *Hooker* in the Chapter cited by him, interprets the words of *Institution*: " If we doubt, *says he*, what those admirable " words may import, let him be our Teacher for the " meaning of Christ, to whom Christ was himself a " School-master. Let our Lord's Apostle be his Interpreter; content we our selves with his Explication; " *My Body, the Communion of my Body*; *My Blood*, " the *Communion of my Blood*. Is there any Thing " more expedite, clear and easie, than that as Christ " is termed our Life, because through him we obtain " Life: So the *parts* of this *Sacrament* are his *Body* and " *Blood*, because they are *Causes instrumental*, upon " the receit whereof the *participation* of his *Body* and " *Blood* ensueth? —— The *Real Presence* of Christ's " most blessed *Body* and *Blood* is not therefore to be " sought for in the *Sacrament*, but in the *worthy Receiver* of the *Sacrament* —— And again *p.* 310. he thus " interprets the same words; This Hallow'd Food " through the concurrence of Divine Power, is in " verity and truth unto faithful Receivers instrumentally a Cause of that *mystical participation*, whereby " as I make my self wholly *theirs*, so I give them in hand " an actual possession of all such saving *Grace* as my sacrificed *Body* can yeild, and as their *Souls* do presently need. *This is* to them and in them *my Body*.

Difference between the Protestant *and* Socinian *Methods, in answer to the Protestants Plea for a* Socinian. pag. 54.

And

And this may ſuffice in Vindication of Mr. *Hooker*. Thoſe who deſire a fuller Account, may find ſeveral Pages to the ſame purpoſe in the Chapter which I have quoted. The next our Author mentions, is the Learned Biſhop *Andrews*, in that much noted paſſage, as he calls it, in the Anſwer to *Bellarmine*.

Biſhop *ANDREWS*. 1 Tract. pag. 7. §. xi. n. 1.

And indeed we need deſire no other Paſſage to judg of his Opinion in this matter; in which 1ſt, He utterly excludes all defining any thing as to the *manner* of Chriſt's *Preſence* in the *Euchariſt*. 2. He profeſſes that a *Preſence* we believe, and that no leſs a *True* one than the *Papiſts*. 3. He plainly inſinuates that the *Preſence* of Chriſt in the *Euchariſt*, was much the ſame as in *Baptiſm*; the very alluſion which the Holy † Fathers were wont to make, to expreſs his *Preſence* by in this Holy Sacrament; which ſince our Adverſaries neither can deny, nor yet ſay is ſo *real*, as to be *Eſſential* or *Corporeal*; they muſt of neceſſity allow that there may be a *true Preſence* (which is all the Biſhop affirms) without ſuch a *Subſtantial* one as this Author here contends for.

† Habemus Chriſtum præſentem ad Baptiſmatis Sacramentum habemus eum præſentem ad Altaris Cibum & Potum. *Auguſtin.* Stola, quæ eſt Eccleſia Chriſti, lavatur in ipſius ſanguine vivo, *i. e.* in lavacro regenerationis. *Origen.* Statim baptizatus in ſanguine agni Vir meruit appellari. *Hieron.* Chriſti ſanguine lavaris, quando in ejus mortem Baptizaris. *Leo. P. &c.*

But to ſhew that whatever this Biſhop underſtood by the *Real Preſence*, it could not be that Chriſt's *glorified Body* is now actually *preſent* in this Sacred *Myſtery*, will appear demonſtratively from this, that he declares it is not this *Body* which we either *repreſent* or *partake* of there; inſomuch that he doubts not to ſay, that could there be a *Tranſubſtantiation*, ſuch as the *Church* of *Rome* ſuppoſes, it would not ſerve our turn, nor anſwer the deſign of this *Sacrament*. 'Tis in his Sermon on 1 *Cor.* v. 7, 8. "We will mark, "ſaith he, ſomething more: That *Epulemur* doth here "refer to *Immolatus*: To Chriſt not *every way conſi-* "*der'd*, but *As* when he was *Offer'd*. Chriſt's *Body* "*that*

See Sermon vii. *on the Reſurrect.* pag. 454. Serm. *Lond.* 1641.

" THAT *now is, true*; But not Christ's *Body* AS *now it is*,
" but *as then it was*, when it was *offer'd, rent*, and *slain*,
" and *sacrificed* for us. Not as now he is *glorified*;
" for so he is not, he cannot be *Immolatus*; For as he
" is, he is immortal and impassible; But as then he was
" when he *suffer'd Death*, that is *passible* and *mortal*.
" Then in his passible State, he did institute this of
" ours, to be *a Memorial* of his *Passible* and *Passion* both.
" And we are in this Action not only *carried* UP *to*
" *Christ (sursum Corda)* [*so that Christ it seems is not*
" *brought down to us*] but we are also *carry'd* BACK *to*
" Christ, as he was at the *very Instant*, and in the
" *very Act* of his *Offering*. So, and no *otherwise*, doth
" this Text teach; So, and no *otherwise* do we *Repre-*
" *sent* him. By the incomprehensible Power of his E-
" ternal Spirit, not *He alone*, but *He as at the very*
" *act of his Offering is made present to us*, and we in-
" corporate into his *Death*, and invested in the *Benefits*
" of it. If an *Host* could be turned into him now
" *glorified* as he is, it would not serve; *Christ offer'd* is
" it. Thither must we look; to the *Serpent lift up:*
" thither we must repair; even *ad Cadaver:* We must
" *Hoc facere*, do that is then done. So and no otherwise
" is this *Epulare* to be conceived. And so I think none
" will say they *do* or *can turn* him.

Whatsoever *Real Presence* then this Bishop believed it must be of his *crucified Body*, and as in the State of his *Death*; and that I think cannot be otherwise *present* than in one of those two ways mentioned above by Arch-Bishop *Cranmer*, and both of which we willingly acknowledg; either *Figuratively*, in the *Action* and *Elements*; or *Spiritually*, in the Souls of those who worthily receive them.

And from this Account of Bishop *Andrews*'s Opinion

CASAUBON, KING JAMES, on, we may conclude what it was that *Caſaubon* and King *James* underſtood by the *Real Preſence*, who inſiſt upon that Biſhop's Words to expreſs their own Notion and Meaning of it. Nor can we make any other Judgment of the Arch-Biſhop of *Spalato*; who in the next § * to that cited by our Adverſary, is very earneſt againſt thoſe who receive *unworthily* this Holy *Sacrament*, and by Conſequence ties not Chriſt's *natural Body* to the *Bread*; and declares it to be after a *ſpiritual imperceptible* and *miraculous* manner. As for the Term *Corporaliter*, which he there uſes, and which *Melanchthon* and ſome others had uſed before him, that may be well enough underſtood in the ſame Sence, as *verè* or *realiter*; and is often ſo uſed both in *Scripture* and in the Holy *Fathers*. As when St. *Paul* ſays of Chriſt, that in *Him dwelleth the fulneſs of the Godhead Bodily*; that is, *really*, in oppoſition to the *Shechinah*, or *Preſence* of God in the *Tabernacle*. And again, *The Body of Chriſt*; that is, the *Subſtance*, the *Reality*, oppoſed to the *Types* and *Figures* of the Law. And ſo in the *Hebrew* Expoſition גוף is often uſed for *Eſſence* as well as *Body*, and applied to *Spiritual* as well as *Corporal* Things.

A. Biſhop of *SPALATO.* *See the* 1. Tract. §. xi. note 2. pag. 7.

* Vol. 3. de Rep. Eccles. lib. 7. cap. 11. pag. 200, 201.

Coloſſ. ii. 9. 17.

See Hammond *in* Coloſſ. 1. Annot. d.

Nor can I ſee any more Reaſon to underſtand Arch-Biſhop *Laud* in any other Sence. He aſſerts the *true* and *real Preſence* of Chriſt in this Sacred Feaſt; but he do's not ſay, that Chriſt's *Natural Body* which is now in *Heaven*, is alſo in this *Holy Sacrament*, or in the *worthy Receiver*; nor have we any Reaſon to believe that he underſtood it ſo to be. * And the ſame muſt be ſaid of † Biſhop *Hall*, Biſhop *Montague*, and Biſhop

Arch-Biſhop *LAUD.*

1 Tract. §. xiv. pag. 8.

† Biſhop *HALL.*

* *MONTAGUE Origenis Eccles.* Tom. prior. par. poſter. p. 247, 249, 250, *&c.* *CREDENTES* fiunt.

Panis in *Synaxi* fit Corpus Chriſti; —— Sed & *Corpus* Chriſti Ad *eundem* utrumque *modum* & menſuram; ſed non *Naturaliter*; —— Itaque nec *Panis* ITA eſt *Corpus* Chriſti; *Myſtice* tantum, non *Phyſice*. vid. plur.

Bilſon

Bilſon; in whoſe expreſſions as they are quoted by our Author, I find nothing that proves the Sence he would impoſe upon them; and whoſe works had I now by me, I might poſſibly be able to give ſome better account of them. Though after all, ſhould one of theſe in his violence againſt his Adverſaries, or the others in their *pacifick deſign* of reconciling all Parties as to this Point, have ſaid more than they ought to do, I do not ſee but that it ought to have been imputed to the circumſtances they were in, and the deſigns they purſued, rather than be ſet up for the meaſure either of their own, or our *Churches* Opinion. *MONTAGUE.* *BILSON.*

And now I am mentioning theſe things, I ought not paſs over one other eminent inſtance of ſuch a charitable undertaking, and which has given occaſion to our Author of a Quotation he might otherwiſe have wanted, in that excellent Biſhop of St. *Andrews*, Biſhop *Forbes*; concerning whoſe Authority in this matter I ſhall offer only the cenſure of one, than whom none could have given a more worthy Character of a perſon, who ſo well deſerved it as that good Biſhop did; "I do not deny, but, his earneſt deſire of a ge- "neral *Peace* and *Union* among all Chriſtians, has "made him too favourable to many of the Corrupti- "ons in the Church of *Rome*: But though a *Charity* "that is not well ballanced, may carry one to very "indiſcreet things; yet the principle from whence "they flow'd in him, was ſo truly good, that the *Er-* "*rors* to which it carry'd him, ought to be either ex- "cuſed, or at leaſt to be very gently cenſured. Biſhop *FORBES.* Author of the Life of Biſhop *BEDEL*; in the Preface.

There remain now but two of all the Divines he has produced to prove his new fancy, which he would ſet up for the *Doctrine* of the *Church of England*; and thoſe as little for his purpoſe as any he has hitherto

Biſhop *TAYLOR.*

mentioned; *viz.* Bp *Taylor* and Mr. *Thorndyke.* For Biſhop *Taylor*, I cannot acquit our *Author* of a wilful prevarication; ſince it is evident that he has ſo plainly oppoſed his Notion, and that in the very Book he quotes, and which he wrote on purpoſe to ſhew our meaning of the *Real Preſence*, that he could not but have known that he *miſ-repreſented* him. I ſhall ſet down the ſtate of the Queſtion as it is in the beginning of that *Treatiſe*. "The *Doctrine* of the *Church* of *Eng-*
"*land*, and generally of the *Proteſtants* in this *Article*
"is; That after the Miniſter of the Holy Myſteries
"hath ritely pray'd and bleſſed, or conſecrated the
"*Bread* and the *Wine*; the *Symbols* become changed
"into the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt after a *Sacramen-*
"*tal, i. e.* in a *Spiritual Real* manner. So that all that
"worthily communicate, do by *Faith receive* Chriſt
"*Really, Effectually*, to all the purpoſes of his Paſſi-
"on.—It is *Bread* and it is *Chriſt's Body*: It is *Bread* in
"in *Subſtance*, Chriſt in the *Sacrament*; and Chriſt is
"as *really* given to all that are truly diſpos'd, as the
"*Symbols* are p. 183.—It is here as in the other Sacra-
"ment; for as there *natural Water* becomes the *Laver*
"*of Regeneration*; ſo here *Bread* and *Wine* become
"the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt: but there and here
"too the firſt *Subſtance* is changed by *Grace*, but re-
"mains the *ſame* in *Nature*—We ſay that Chriſt's *Body*
"is in the Sacrament *really*, but *ſpiritually*. They (the
"*Papiſts*) ſay it is there *really*, but *ſpiritually*. For ſo *Bel-*
"*larmin* in bold to ſay that the word may be allowed in
"this Queſtion. Where now is the difference? Here;
"By *Spiritually* they mean preſent after the manner
"of a *Spirit*; by *Spiritually* we mean preſent to our
"*Spirit only*; that is, ſo as Chriſt is not preſent to any
"other Sence but that of *faith* or *ſpiritual* ſuſception—

Polemical diſcourſes. p. 182. *London*, 1674.

"They

"They ſay that Chriſt's *Body* is *truly* preſent there, as "it was upon the *Croſs*, but not after the *manner* of all, "or any *Body*— But we by the *real Spiritual Preſence* of "Chriſt, do underſtand Chriſt to be preſent, as the Spi- "rit of God is preſent in the Hearts of the Faithful, by "*Bleſſing* and *Grace*; and this is *ALL we mean* beſides "the *tropical* and *figurative* preſence.

Such is the Account which that Excellent Biſhop here gives not only of his own, but as he expreſly terms it, of the *Church of* England's, *and the Generality of the Proteſtants Belief in this Matter.* Our Author's diſſimulation of it is ſo much the more inexcuſable, by how much the more zealous an Advocate he makes him of his Cauſe, when all this that I have tranſcribed, was in the very ſame Section, and almoſt in the ſame Page with what he has cited. For his little Remark upon the Title of the Biſhop's Book, where he calls it of the *Real Preſence* and *Spiritual*, whence he would infer a difference between the two Terms, and find ſomething *Real* that is not *Spiritual* in this *Sacrament*; it is evident that the Deſign of that Diſtinction was this: There be ſeveral ſorts of *Real Preſences*; the *Papiſts*, the *Lutherans*, the *Church* of *England*, all allow a *Real Preſence* in the *Sacrament*, but after diſferent *Manners*; it was therefore neceſſary to add ſomewhat more, to ſhew what kind of *Real Preſence* he undertook to maintain, and he knew no word more proper to expreſs it by than *Spiritual*, which does not therefore imply a Diſtinction from, but Limitation of the other Term *Real.* And thus he explains it, *N.* 6. and 7. of that Section, where he ſhews that the *Spiritual* is alſo a *Real Preſence*, and indeed more properly ſo than any other. In ſhort, thus he concludes the State of the Queſtion, in the ſame Sec-

Treatiſe of, p. 20th.

Pag. 183.

Pag. 186.

on, between us and the *Church* of *Rome*, ſo that now, *ſays he*, The Queſtion is not, "Whether the *Symbols* "be *changed* into Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood* or no? For "it is granted on all ſides: But whether this *Converſi-* "*on* be *Sacramental* and *Figurative?* Or whether it be "*Natural* aud *Bodily?* Nor is it whether Chriſt be "taken *Really*, but whether he be taken in a *Spiritual* "or in a *Natural Manner?* We ſay the Converſion is "*Figurative*, *Myſterious*, and *Sacramental*; they ſay, "it is *Proper*, *Natural*, and *Corporal*. We affirm that "Chriſt is *really taken* by *Faith*, by the *Spirit*, *to all* "*real Effects* of his Paſſion (this is an Explication a little different from our Authors) "They ſay he is taken "by the *Mouth*, and that the *Spiritual* and the *Virtual* "taking him in *Virtue* or *Effect*, is not ſufficient, tho, "done alſo in the Sacrament. *Hic Rhodus, hic Saltus.*

If this does not yet ſatisfie him that he has injur'd this Learned Man in the Repreſentation of his Opinion, directly contrary to his Senſe, I will offer him yet one Paſſage more, taken from another part of his Works, and which, I hope, will throughly convince him. It is in the *5th* Letter to a Gentleman that was tempted to the Communion of the *Church* of *Rome*. He had propoſed to the Biſhop this Queſtion: "Whe- "ther, without all danger of *Superſtition* or *Idolatry*, "we may not render Divine *Worſhip* to our Bleſſed "Saviour, as preſent in the Bleſſed *Sacrament* or *Hoſt*, "according to his *Humane Nature*, in that *Hoſt?* The Queſtion is certainly every way pertinent to our preſent Purpoſe; let us ſee what the Anſwer is that he makes to it. "We may not render *Divine Worſhip* "to him as *preſent* in the Bleſſed *Sacrament* according "to his *Humane Nature*, without danger of *Idolatry*, "becauſe he is not there according to his *Humane Na-* "*ture*,

See *Polemic. Diſc. Append. Pag.* 69, 70.

"*ture*, and therefore you give Divine Worſhip to a "*Non-Ens*, which muſt needs be *Idolatry*. Well, but ſtill it may be the Biſhop does not intend to exclude the *Corpus Domini*, but only the *Corporal* or *Natural Manner* of that *Body*: Let us therefore hear how he goes on. "For *Idolum nihil eſt in mundo*, ſaith "St. *Paul*; and Chriſt as *Preſent* by his *Humane Nature* "in the *Sacrament* is a *Non-ens*. For it is not true; "there is no ſuch thing. What, not as Chriſt there, no way as to his Humane nature?— No, he is, *ſaith the* "*Biſhop*, preſent there by his Divine power, and his "Divine Bleſſing, and the *Fruits* of his *Body*, the *real* "*effective Conſequents* of his *Paſſion*; but for *any other* "*Preſence*, it is *Idolum*; it is nothing in the World. A- "dore Chriſt in Heaven; for the Heaven muſt contain "him tell the time of reſtitution of all things. This then is Biſhop *Taylor*'s Notion of the *Real Preſence*: and now I am confident our Author himſelf will remit him to the Company of thoſe Old *Zuinglian* Biſhops, *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, and the reſt, who lived before that Queen *Elizabeth* had *propugned* the *Real Preſence* of his new Model in the Heads of the *Governours* of the *Church* of *England*.

Treat. 1. pag. 10.

And now I am afraid his Cauſe will be deſperate unleſs Mr. *Thorndyke* can ſupport it. And how unlikely he is to do it, he might have learnt from what has been anſwered to *T. G.* on the ſame Occaſion. ‖ *T. G.* had in his firſt *Dialogue* quoted the ſame place which our Author has done ſince, to prove his belief of the *Real Preſence*: His * *Adverſary* confeſſes this, but produces another that explains his meaning; "† if "it can any way be ſhew'd, *ſays he*, that the *Church* "did ever pray that the *Fleſh* and *Blood* might be ſubſti- "tuted inſtead of the Elements under the Accidents of "them

Mr. *THORNDYKE*.

‖ *T. G.* Dialogue 1ſt. Pag. 21.

* Anſwer to *T. G*'s Dial. Pag. 92.

† *THORNDYKE*, Laws of the Church. *Ch.* 4. *Pag.* 30.

"them, then I am content that this be accounted "henceforth the *Sacramental preſence* of them in the "*Euchariſt*. But if the *Church* only prays that the Spi- "rit of God coming down upon the *Elements*—— may "make them the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt, ſo that "they which receive them may be *filled* with the *Grace* "of his *Spirit*; then is it not the Sence of the *Catholick* "*Church* that can oblige any man to believe the abo- "liſhing of the *Elements* in their *bodily ſubſtance*, be- "cauſe ſuppoſing that they remain, they may never- "theleſs come to be the inſtruments of God's Spirit "to convey the operation thereof to them that are di- "ſpos'd to receive it, no otherwiſe than his *Fleſh* and "*Blood* convey'd the *Efficacy* thereof upon Earth. And "that I ſuppoſe is reaſon enough to call it the *Body* "and *Blood* of Chriſt *Sacramentally*, that is to ſay, as in "the *Sacrament* of the *Euchariſt*.

Thus Mr. *Thorndyke* expreſſes himſelf as to the *Real Preſence*; But yet after all, I will not deny but that this Learned Perſon ſeems to have had a particular Notion in this matter, and which is far enough from what our *Author* would fix upon him. He thought that the *Elements* by *Conſecration* were united to the Godhead of Chriſt, much after the ſame manner as his *Natural Body* was by *Incarnation*; and that ſo the very *Elements* became after a ſort his *Body*. "The Church "from the beginning did not pretend to conſecrate by "theſe bare words, *This is my Body, this is my Blood*, "as operatory in changing the Elements into the *Body* "and *Blood* of Chriſt; but by that Word of God "whereby he hath declared the Inſtitution of this Sa- "crament, and commanded the uſe of it; and by the "Execution of this Command. Now it is executed, "and hath always been executed by the Act of the "*Church*

See his Juſt Weights and Meaſures, 4to. *Lond.* 1662.— Pag. 94.

"*Church* upon God's Word of *Inſtitution*, praying "that the Holy Ghoſt coming down upon the preſent "*Elements*, may make them the *Body* and *Blood of* "*Chriſt*. Not by *changing* them into the *Nature* of "*Fleſh* and *Blood*; as the *Bread* and *Wine* that nou-"riſhed our Lord Chriſt on Earth, became the *Fleſh* "and *Blood* of the Son of God, by becoming the *Fleſh* "and *Blood* of his Manhood, *Hypoſtatically* united to "his *Godhead*, ſaith *Gregory Nyſſene*. But immediate-"ly and *ipſo facto*, by being united to the *Spirit* of "Chriſt; *i. e.* his *Godhead*. For the *Fleſh* and *Blood* "of Chriſt by *Incarnation*, the *Elements* by *Conſecra-"tion* being united to the *Spirit*, *i. e.* the *Godhead* of "Chriſt, become both one *Sacramentally*, by being both "one with the *Spirit* or *Godhead* of Chriſt, to the con-"veying of God's *Spirit* to a Chriſtian.

And thus have I conſider'd the ſeveral *Divines* produced for this new Conceit concerning the *Real Preſence*; and ſhewn the greateſt part of his Authors to be evidently againſt it; ſome not to have ſpoken ſo clearly that we can determine any thing concerning them; but not one that favours what they were alledged for; *viz.* to ſhew that they believed Chriſt's *Natural Body* to be both in *Heaven* and in the *Sacrament*; only after another *manner* than the *Papiſts*. It were an eaſie matter to ſhew how conſtant our *Church* has been to the *Doctrine* of the *true*, *real*, *ſpiritual Preſence* which it ſtill aſſerts, and which it derived from its firſt Reformers, whoſe words have been before ſet down by a *cloud* of other Witneſſes; as may be ſeen by the ſhort *Specimen* I have put together in the * *Margent*. But I have inſiſted too long already on this matter; and ſhall therefore paſs on to the *Third* thing I propoſed to conſider; *viz.*

* Reformatio legum Eccleſ. ex Authorit. *Henr.* 8. & *Edw.* 6. *Lond.* 1641. Tit. de Sacram. cap. 4. pag. 29.——*Morton* de Euch. part. 2. Claſ. 4. cap. 1. §. 2. pag. 224. *Lat.* 1640. *4to.*——*Fr. White* againſt *Fiſher*, pag. 407. *Lond.* 1624. Fol.——A. B. *Uſher's*,

B. *Uſher*'s Anſwer to a Challenge, C. of the *Real Preſence*, p. 44, 45. *Lond.* 1625.—— Id. Serm before the Houſe of Commons, pag. 16, 19, &c.——Dr. *Hammond* Pract. Catech. part. *ult* Anſwer to this Queſtion; the Importance of theſe words, *That the Body and Blood of Chriſt are verily and indeed taken and received*, p. 130. Edit. *Lond.* Fol. 1684.—— Dr. *Jackſon*'s Works, *Tom.* 3. pag. 300, 302. *Lond.* 1673. Dr. *Jo. White*'s Way to the True Church, *Lond.* 1624. §. 51. N. 10. pag. 209. *Coſens* Hiſt. Tranſubſt. p. 3, 4, 12, *&c.* Edit. *Lond.* 1675. *8vo.*

Thirdly, That the *Alterations* which have been made in our *Rubrick*, were not upon the account of our Divines changing their Opinions, as is vainly and falſly ſuggeſted.

To give a rational Account of this Affair, we muſt carefully conſider the Circumſtances of the Times, the Tempers and Diſpoſitions of the Perſons that lived in them; and what the Deſigns of the *Governing* Parties were with reference to them; and then we ſhall preſently ſee both a great deal of Wiſdom and Piety in the making of theſe *Alterations*; allowing the Opinions of thoſe who did it, to have continued, as we have ſeen, in all of them the ſame.

When firſt this *Rubrick* was put into King *Edward*'s Liturgy, the *Church* of *England* was but juſt riſing up out of the Errors and Superſtitions with which it had been over-run by the prevalency of *Popery* upon it. It had the happineſs to be *reformed*, not as moſt others were, by private perſons, and in many places contrary to the deſires of the *Civil Power*; but by a Unanimous Concurrence of the Higheſt *Authority* both *Civil* and *Eccleſiaſtical*, of *Church* and *State*. Hence it came to paſs, that *Convocations* being aſſembled, *Deliberations* had of the greateſt and wiſeſt Perſons for the proceeding in it, nothing was done out of a Spirit of Peeviſhneſs or Oppoſition; the *Holy Scriptures* and *Antiquity* were carefuly conſulted; and all things examined according to the exacteſt meaſures that could be taken from them; and a diligent diſtinction made of what

was

was *Popery*, and what *true* and *Catholick Chriſtianity*, that ſo the. One only might be rejected, the other duly retained.

Now by this means it was that the Ancient *Government* of the *Church* became preſerved amongſt us; a juſt and wiſe *Liturgy* collected out of the *Publick Rituals*: Whatever *Ceremonies* were requiſite for *Order* or *Decency*, were retain'd; and among the reſt, that of receiving the *Communion kneeling* for One, which has accordingly ever ſince been the manner eſtabliſh'd amongſt us. But that no Occaſion of Scandal might hereby be given, whether to our *Neighbour-Churches* abroad, or to any particular Members of our own at home: That thoſe who were yet weak in the Faith, might not either continue or fall back into Error, and by our retaining the ſame *Ceremony* in the *Communion* that they had been uſed to in the *Maſs*, fancy that they were to *adore* the *Bread* as they did before: For all theſe great Ends this Caution was inſerted; that the true Intent of this *Ceremony* was only for *Decency* and *Order*; not that any *Adoration* was thereby *intended, or ought to be done unto any Real or Eſſential Preſence of Chriſt's Natural Fleſh and Blood, which were not there, but in Heaven, it being againſt the Truth of Chriſt's Natural Body to be at One time in more places than One.*

And this is ſufficiently intimated in the words of the *Rubrick* to have been the firſt Cauſe and Deſign of it. Thus it continued the remainder of King *Edward*'s time: But now Queen *Elizabeth* being come to the Crown, there were other Circumſtances to be conſider'd. Thoſe of the *Reformed* Religion abroad were ſufficiently ſatisfied, both by this *publick Declaration*, which had ſtood ſo many years in the *Liturgy* of our

Church; and by the Converſation and Acquaintance of our Divines, forced by the diſperſion in the foregoing Reign, to ſeek for refuge among their Brethren in other Countryes, of our Orthodox Faith, as to this Point. Our own Members at home had heard too much of this matter in the publick Writings and Diſputations, and in the conſtant Sufferings of their *Martyrs*, not to know that the *Popiſh Real Preſence* was a meer Figment, an *Idolum*, as Biſhop *Taylor* juſtly ſtiles it; and their *Maſs* to be *abhorred* rather than *adored*. There was then no longer need of this *Rubrick* upon any of thoſe Accounts for which it was firſt eſtabliſh'd; and there was a very juſt reaſon now to lay it aſide. That great *Queen* deſired, if poſſible, to compoſe the Minds of her Subjects, and make up thoſe Diviſions which the differences of *Religion*, and the late unhappy Conſequences of them had occaſion'd. For this, ſhe made it her buſineſs to render the publick Acts of the *Church* of *England* as agreeable to all Parties as Truth would permit. The Clauſe of the *Real Preſence* inſerted in the *Articles* of her firſt *Convocation*, and *ſubſcribed* by all the *Members* of it (to ſhew that their belief was ſtill the ſame it had ever been as to this matter) was nevertheleſs, as we have ſeen, ſtruck out for this end their next Seſſion. The Title of *Head* of the *Church*, which her Father had firſt taken, her Brother continued, and was from both derived to her, ſo qualified and explained, as might prevent any Occaſion of quarrelling at it by the moſt captious perſons. That Petition in the *Litany* inſerted by King *Henry* viii. "*From the Tyranny of the Biſhop of* "Rome, *and all his deteſtable Enormities, Good Lord*, &c. ſtruck out: And in conformity to what was done in the *Articles* as to this Point, this *Rubrick* alſo was omitted, leſt it ſhould give *Offence* to thoſe who where ſtill zea-

zealous for their miſtaken Principles and Worſhip. This was the Wiſe and Chriſtian Deſign of that Excellent *Princeſs*; and how happy an Effect this Moderation might have had, if the Biſhop of *Rome* had not by his Artifice and Authority with ſome of her Subjects, prevented it, the firſt Years of her Reign ſufficiently ſhew.

Thus was the Occaſion and Reaſon of its Omiſſion in Q. *Elizabeth*'s Time, as great as the neceſſity of its firſt Inſertion in King *Edward*'s. And in this ſtate it continued all the Reign of that *Queen*, and of her two Succeſſors, King *James* and King *Charles* 1*ſt*, I ſhall not need to ſay by what means it was, that new Occaſion was given for the reviving of it. We have all of us heard, and many of us ſeen too much of it. How Order became Superſtitious, and Decency termed Idolatry: The *Church* of *England* traduced as but another Name for *Popery*; and this *Cuſtom* of *kneeling at the Communion*, one of the ſtrongeſt Arguments offer'd for the Proof of it. And now when Panick Fears had found ſuch prevalence over the Minds of Men, as to deſtroy a King, and embroil a Kingdom into a *Civil War*, of almoſt Twenty Years continuance; and tho by the good Hand of God, our King and our Peace were again reſtored, yet the Minds of the People were ſtill unſetled, and in danger of being again blown up upon the leaſt Occaſion: What could be more adviſable to juſtify our ſelves from all ſuſpicion of *Popery* in this matter, and induce them to a *Conformity* with us in a *Ceremony* they had entertain'd ſuch a dread of, than to revive that ancient *Rubrick*; and ſo quiet the Minds of the People now, by the ſame means by which they had been ſetled and ſecured before?

This I am perſuaded is ſo *rational* an Account, as will both juſtify the Proceedings of our Governours in theſe Changes, and ſhew the diſ-ingenuity of thoſe, who not

only knowing, but having been told theſe Things, will ſtill rather impute it to an imaginary wavering, or uncertainty of Opinion, than to a Neceſſary and Chriſtian Accommodation to the Times.

For the change in the Prayer of *Conſecration*, I have already ſaid, that 'tis in the *Words*, not the *Senſe*: And if our Governours thought the preſent Expreſſions leſs liable to exception than the former, they had certainly reaſon for the Alteration.

For the other Exceptions there is very little in them, whether the Miniſter lay his Hand on the Sacred Elements, when he repeats the Words of *Inſtitution*, as at this time, or only conſecrates them by the Prayers of the *Church*, and the Words of Chriſt, without any other *Ceremony*, as heretofore: Whether with the *Church* of *Rome* we uſe only the words of Chriſt in the diſtribution; or with moſt of the Reformed Churches, the other Expreſſion, "*Take and eat this, &c.* or (as we chuſe rather) joyn them both together: Whether we ſing the *Gloria in Excelſis Deo*—before or after the receiving; but becauſe the chiefeſt Myſtery he thinks lies in this, That whereas in King *Edward*'s days the *Rubrick* called it an *Eſſential Preſence*, which we have now turned into *Corporeal*; I muſt confeſs I will not undertake to ſay what the Occaſion of it was; if they thought this latter manner more free from giving Offence than the other would have been, I think they did well to prefer it. Let every one entertain what Notion he pleaſes of theſe Things; this I have ſhewn is the Doctrine of the *Church* which we all ſubſcribe, "That the *Natural Body* and *Blood* of our "Saviour Chriſt are in *Heaven*, and not *here*; *i. e.* in the Sacrament; and if there can be any other *Real Preſence* than ſuch as I have made appear to have been the conſtant belief of our Divines conſiſtent with this *Rubrick*,

I ſhall no more deſire to debar any one the belief of it, than I ſhall be willing to be obliged to believe it with him.

And now after ſo clear an Account as I have here given of the ſeveral Changes that have been made in our *Rubrick*, were I minded to recriminate, and tell the World what *Alterations* have been made in their *Maſs*, and thoſe in Points infinitely more material than any thing that can be alledged againſt us, I much queſtion whether they would be able to give us ſo good an account of it. And ſomething of this I may perhaps offer as a *Specimen* of the wiſdom of this *Author* in the choice of his Accuſation before we part; In the mean time I go on to the laſt Thing propoſed to be here conſider'd,

Fourthly, That the *Reaſon* mention'd in our *Rubrick* concerning the *Impoſſibility* of Chriſt's *Natural Body*'s exiſting in *ſeveral Places* at the *ſame Time*, is no way invalidated by any of this *Author*'s Exceptions againſt it.

Now theſe being moſt of them founded upon the former miſtaken Notion of the *Real Preſence* falſely imputed to us, will admit of a very ſhort and plain Conſideration.

1*ſt*. He *obſerves* "That *Proteſtants*, but eſpecially our "*Engliſh Divines*, generally confeſs the *Preſence* of our "Saviour in the Euchariſt to be an *ineffable Myſtery*. Well, be it ſo; what will he hence infer? Why "this "he conceives is ſaid to be ſo in reſpect of ſomething in "it *oppoſite* and *contradictory* to, and therefore incom- "prehenſible and ineffable by *Human Reaſon*. But ſuppoſing they ſhould not think it ſo from being *Oppoſite* and *Contradictory* to, but becauſe the manner how Chriſt herein communicates himſelf to us is *hid from*, and

Treatiſe 1*ſt*. §. xx. n. 1. pag. 13.

and *above* our Human Reaſon; might not this be ſufficient to make it ſtill be called an *ineffable*, and *incomprehenſible Myſtery*? Whereas the other would make it rather plain and *comprehenſible Nonſence*. 'Tis a ſtrange Affection that ſome Men have got of late for *Contradictions*; they are ſo in love with them, that they have almoſt brought it to be the definition of a *Myſtery*, to be the *Revelation* of ſomething to be believ'd in *Oppoſition to Senſe and Reaſon*. And what by their *Notions* and *Parallels*, have advanced no very commendable Character of Chriſtianity; as if it were a *Religion* full of *Abſurdities*; and as *Fiſher* the Jeſuit once told King *James* 1*ſt*, with reference to this very Subject, *the rather to be believed, becauſe it is contrary to Reaſon*. But if this be indeed our Author's Notion of *Myſteries* (and the truth is *Tranſubſtantiation* can be no other *Myſtery*) we deſire he will be pleaſed to confine it to his own *Church*, and not ſend it abroad into the World as ours too. We are perſwaded, not only that our *Worſhip* muſt be a *reaſonable Service*, but our *Faith* a *Reaſonable Aſſent*. He who oppoſes the Authority of Holy Scriptures, "againſt manifeſt and certain *Reaſon*, do's nei- "ther underſtand himſelf nor them. *Reaſon* is the Voice of God as well as *Revelation*, and what is oppoſite to the one, can no more be agreeable to the other, than God can be contrary to himſelf. And though, if the *Revelation* be *clear* and *evident*, we ſubmit to it, becauſe we are then ſure it cannot be *contrary* to *Reaſon*, whatever it may appear to us; yet when the *Contradiction* is *manifeſt*, as that a *natural Body ſhould be in more places than one at the ſame time*, we are ſure that Interpretation of Holy *Scripture* can never be the right which would infer this, but eſpecially when there is another, and much more reaſonable, that do's not. And in this we are after all

Biſhop *TAYLOUR'S* Polem. Diſco. of the *Real Preſence*. §. ii. pag. 231.

Ibid.

all juſtified by one whoſe Authority I hope our *Author* will not queſtion, even his own ſelf; IF, *ſays he*, WE ARE CERTAIN THERE IS A CONTRADICTION, THEN WE ARE CERTAIN THERE NEITHER IS NOR CAN BE A CONTRARY REVELATION; AND WHEN ANY REVELATION, THO' NEVER SO PLAIN, IS BROUGHT; WE ARE BOUND TO INTERPRET IT SO, AS NOT TO AFFIRM A CERTAINLY KNOWN IMPOSSIBILITY. And let him that ſticks to this Rule, interpret Chriſt's Words for *Tranſubſtantiation* if he can. Treatiſe 1ſt. §. 29. pag. 21.

"But do not our own *Authors* ſometimes ſay, that "notwithſtanding all the Difficulties brought againſt "*Tranſubſtantiation*, yet if it can be ſhewn that God "has revealed it, they are ready to believe it? Perhaps ſome may have ſaid this, becauſe for that very Reaſon that there are ſo many *Contradictions* in it, they are ſure it cannot be ſhewn that God has *revealed* it. But if he means, as he ſeems to inſinuate, that notwithſtanding ſuch *plain Contractictions* as they charge it with, they thought it poſſible nevertheleſs, that God might have revealed it, and upon that Suppoſition, they were ready to believe it; I anſwer from his own Words, that their ſuppoſal then was *Abſurd* and *impoſſible*; ſince he himſelf aſſures us, that NONE CAN BELIEVE A THING TRUE, UPON WHAT MOTIVE SOEVER, WHICH HE FIRST KNOWS TO BE CERTAINLY FALSE, OR WHICH IS ALL ONE, CERTAINLY TO CONTRADICT. "For theſe we ſay *are not* "*verifiable by a Divine Power*; and *Ergo*, here I may ſay, "ſhould a Divine Power declare a Truth, it would tran-"ſcend it ſelf. Which laſt Words, if they ſignify any Thing, and do not *tranſcend Senſe*, muſt ſuppoſe it impoſſible for ſuch a Thing as implies a *certain Contradiction*, to be revealed. Treatiſe 1ſt. §. xx. n. 3. pag. 14.

II. *Obſervation.* But our *Author* goes on, "I conceive that

" that any one Thing that ſeemeth to us to include a " Perfect *Contradiction*, can no more be effected by divine " Power than another, or than many others the like may. " Seeing then we admit that ſome ſeeming *Contradicti-* " *ons* to Reaſon may be verified by the Divine Power in " this *Sacrament*, there is no reaſon to deny but that this " may be alſo as well as any other.

Now not to contend with him about Words; Whoever told our Author, that we allow'd that there was any thing in this Sacrament, as received by us, that *ſeemed* to us to include a *Perfect Contradiction*? *Perfect Contradictions* we confeſs are all of them *equally verifiable by a Divine Power*, that is, they are all of them *impoſſible*. And for this we have his own word before. Now if there be any ſuch things as *perfect Contradictions* to be known by us, then that which *ſeems to us* to be a *perfect Contradiction*, muſt *really be a perfect Contradiction*; unleſs *Contradictions* are to be diſcover'd ſome other way than by ſeeming to our *Perſon* to be ſo. And ſuch it not only *ſeems*, but undoubtedly *is* for the ſame *One, natural, finite* Body, to be in more *places* than *one* at the *ſame time*; if *to be*, and not *to be*, be ſtill the meaſure of *Contradictions*. He that ſays of ſuch a *Body*, that it is in *Heaven* and on *Earth*, at *London* and *Rome* at the *ſame time*, ſays in Effect that 'tis *one* and *not one*: *finite* and *not finite*; *in one place* and *not in one place*, &c. All which are ſuch *ſeemingly perfect Contradictions*, that I fear 'twill be a hard matter to find out any *Power* by which they *can be verifi'd*.

Treatiſe 1ſt. §. xxii. p. 15.

III. *Obſervation.* He obſerves Thirdly; " That thoſe " who affirm a *Real* and *Subſtantial Preſence* of the *very* " *Body* of Chriſt to the worthy Communicant, contra- " diſtinct to any ſuch other *Real Preſence* of Chriſt's *Bo-* " *dy*, as implies only a *Preſence* of it in *Virtue*, and *Spiri-* " *tual*

"*tual Effects*, &c. muſt hold this particular *ſeeming* "*Contradiction* to be *True*, or ſome other equivalent to "it.

If by the *Real Preſence* of the *very Body of Chriſt*, he means, as he before explains it, That Chriſt's *Natural Body*, that *very Body which is now in Heaven, ſhould be alſo at the ſame time here upon Earth*; it is, I think, neceſſary for thoſe who will affirm this, to hold ſome ſuch kind of *Contradiction*, as he ſays: And 'tis for that very *Reaſon*, I am perſwaded, he will find but few ſuch Perſons in the *Church* of *England*; which ſo expreſly declares, that Chriſt's *Natural Body* is in *Heaven*, and *not here*, upon this very account, "*That it is contrary to the truth of a Natural* "*Body to be in more places than one at the ſame time.* However, if any ſuch there be, as they herein depart from the *Doctrine* of their *Church*, ſo it is not our concern to anſwer for their *Contradictions.*

IV. He obſerves, laſtly: "It ſeems to me that "ſome of the more Judicious amongſt them (the "Divines of the *Church* of *England*) have not laid "ſo great a weight on this Philoſophical Poſition, as "*wholly* to ſupport and regulate their Faith in this mat- "ter by it; as it ſtands in oppoſition not only to *Na-* "*ture's*, but the *Divine Power*: becauſe they pretend "not any ſuch certainty thereof, but that if any Di- "vine *Revelation* of the contrary can be ſhewed, they "profeſs a readineſs to believe it. Tract. 1. §. xxviii. p. 20.

I ſhall not now trouble my ſelf with what ſome of our Divines may ſeem to him to have done in this matter; 'tis evident our *Church* has laid ſtreſs enough upon this *Contradiction.* Indeed where ſo many groſs Repugnancies both to *Senſe* and *Reaſon*

are crowded together, as we have ſeen before there are in this *Point*, it ought not to be wondered if our *Divines* have not ſupported and regulated their Faith *wholly* upon this one alone. We do not any of Us think it either ſafe or pious to be too nice in determining what God *can*, or *cannot* do; we leave that to the bold Inquiſitiveneſs of their *Schools*. But this we think we may ſay, that if there are any unalterable Laws of Nature, by which we are to judg of theſe things; then God can no more make *one* Body to exiſt in *ten thouſand places* at the *ſame time*, than he can make *one*, continuing *one*, to be *ten thouſand*, than he can *divide* the ſame thing from *its ſelf*, and yet continue it ſtill *undivided*. And if any of our Divines have ſaid, that they cannot admit that one Body can be in ſeveral places at once, "till the Papiſts can demonſtrate the poſſibility "thereof by Teſtimony of Holy Scripture, or the "ancient Tradition of the Primitive Church, or "by apparent Reaſon; We need not ſuppoſe that they ſaid this, doubting whether it implied a *Contradiction*, but becauſe the certainty of the *Contradiction* ſecured them againſt the poſſibility of any ſuch Proof. *

* *This is evident in* B. Taylor, *who thought that God could not do this, becauſe* it implied a contradiction. *Real Preſence*, §. xi. n. 1. p. 230. *and* Ibid. n. 27. *He ſaith*, 'tis utterly impoſſible. *So alſo Dr.* White *profeſſes, that*, according to the Order which God has fixed by his Word and Will, this cannot be done: *Confer. pag.* 446, 447. and before, *pag.* 181. *to this Objection*, That tho in Nature it be impoſſible, for one and the ſame Body to be in many places at once, yet becauſe God is Omnipotent, he is able to effect it: We anſwer, *ſays he*, It implieth a *Contradiction*, that God ſhould deſtroy the Nature of a Thing, the Nature of the ſame Thing remaining ſafe: *See more*, p. 180, 181. White's *Works*, Lond. 1624.

And now I know but one Objection more that is, or can be offered againſt what I have ſaid, and which having anſwered, I ſhall cloſe this Point: "For if "this

"this be all the *Church* of *England* underſtands, when it ſpeakes of a *Real Preſence*, viz. *A Real Sacramental Preſence of Chriſt's Body and Blood in the Holy Signs, and a real Spiritual Preſence in the inward Communion of them to the Soul of every worthy Receiver*; will not this *precipitate us* into downright ‖ *Zuinglianiſm*, and render us after all our pretences as very *Sacramentaries* as they? Indeed, I am not able directly to ſay whether it will or no, becauſe I find the Opinion of *Zuinglius* very variouſly repreſented as to this matter. But yet, Firſt, If by *Zuinglianiſm* he means that which is more properly * *Socinianiſm*, viz. *a meer Commemoration of Chriſt's Death*, and a *Thankſgiving to God for it*; 'tis evident it does not, foraſmuch as we poſitively confeſs, that in this *Holy Sacrament* there is a *Real* and *Spiritual Grace* communicated to us, even all the benefits of that *Death* and *Paſſion* which we there *ſet forth*. And this, or ſomewhat very like it, I find ſometimes to have been maintained by † *Zuinglius*. But now, Secondly, If by *Zuinglianiſm* he underſtands ſuch a *Real Preſence*, as denies only the Co-exiſtence of Chriſt's *Natural Body* now in *Heaven*, at the ſame time in this *Holy Sacrament*, but denies nothing of that *Real* and *Spiritual* * *Communion* of it, we have before mentioned; this is indeed our *Doctrine*, nor ſhall we be aſhamed to own it for any *ill Names* he is able to put upon it. But yet I wonder why he ſhould call this *Zuinglianiſm*; ſince if the common name of *Catholick*, or *Chriſtian Doctrine*, be not ſufficient, he might have found out a more ancient Abettor of this

‖ *See* 1. *Treatiſe*, pag. 23. §. xxxii. p.24. §. xxxii.p.25. §. xxxvi, xxxvii, *&c.*

* Smalcius de Cœn. Dom. p. 347. Id Diſp. 9. de Hypocr. p. 289. Volkelius lib. iv. cap. 12. p. 304, 319, *&c.* Socinus in Præneſi, c. iv. Sclichtingius diſ. de Cœn. Dom. p. 701.

† Zuingl. *See* de Provid. Dei, cap. 6, *&c.*

* *And this our Author ſeems to inſinuate: See the places above cited. And indeed others have alledged this as the true Opinion of* Zuinglius: *See* Calvin. Tract. de Cœn. Dom. Defenſ. Sacram. Admonit. ad Weſtphal. & Paſſim. alibi. Vid. inſuper libr. de Orthod. Concenſ. c. 7. *And eſpecially* Hoſpin. p. 42, 55. 177, *&c.* Hiſt. Sacr. *Part.* 2.

are crowded together, as we have ſeen before there are in this *Point*, it ought not to be wondered if our *Divines* have not ſupported and regulated their Faith *wholly* upon this one alone. We do not any of Us think it either ſafe or pious to be too nice in determining what God *can*, or *cannot* do; we leave that to the bold Inquiſitiveneſs of their *Schools*. But this we think we may ſay, that if there are any unalterable Laws of Nature, by which we are to judg of theſe things; then God can no more make *one* Body to exiſt in *ten thouſand places* at the *ſame time*, than he can make *one*, continuing *one*, to be *ten thouſand*, than he can *divide* the ſame thing from *its ſelf*, and yet continue it ſtill *undivided*. And if any of our Divines have ſaid, that they cannot admit that one Body can be in ſeveral places at once, "till the Papiſts can demonſtrate the poſſibility "thereof by Teſtimony of Holy Scripture, or the "ancient Tradition of the Primitive Church, or "by apparent Reaſon; We need not ſuppoſe that they ſaid this, doubting whether it implied a *Contradiction*, but becauſe the certainty of the *Contradiction* ſecured them againſt the poſſibility of any ſuch Proof. *

* *This is evident in* B. Taylor, *who thought that God could not do this, becauſe* it implied a contradiction. *Real Preſence*, §. xi. n. 1. p. 230. *and* Ibid. n. 27. *He ſaith*, 'tis utterly impoſſible. *So alſo Dr.* White *profeſſes, that*, according to the Order which God has fixed by his Word and Will, this cannot be done: *Conſer. pag.* 446, 447. and before, *pag.* 181. *to this Objection*, That tho in Nature it be impoſſible, for one and the ſame Body to be in many places at once, yet becauſe God is Omnipotent, he is able to effect it: We anſwer, *ſays he*, It implieth a *Contradiction*, that God ſhould deſtroy the Nature of a Thing, the Nature of the ſame Thing remaining ſafe: *See more*, p. 180, 181. White's *Works*, Lond. 1624.

And now I know but one Objection more that is, or can be offered againſt what I have ſaid, and which having anſwered, I ſhall cloſe this Point: "For if "this

"this be all the *Church* of *England* underſtands, when it ſpeakes of a *Real Preſence*, viz. *A Real Sacramental Preſence of Chriſt's Body and Blood in the Holy Signs, and a real Spiritual Preſence in the inward Communion of them to the Soul of every worthy Receiver*; will not this *precipitate us* into downright ‖ *Zuinglianiſm*, and render us after all our pretences as very *Sacramentaries* as they? Indeed, I am not able directly to ſay whether it will or no, becauſe I find the Opinion of *Zuinglius* very variouſly repreſented as to this matter. But yet, Firſt, If by *Zuinglianiſm* he means that which is more properly * *Socinianiſm*, viz. *a meer Commemoration of Chriſt's Death*, and a *Thankſgiving to God for it*; 'tis evident it does not, foraſmuch as we poſitively confeſs, that in this *Holy Sacrament* there is a *Real* and *Spiritual Grace* communicated to us, even all the benefits of that *Death* and *Paſſion* which we there *ſet forth*. And this, or ſomewhat very like it, I find ſometimes to have been maintained by † *Zuinglius*. But now, Secondly, If by *Zuinglianiſm* he underſtands ſuch a *Real Preſence*, as denies only the Coexiſtence of Chriſt's *Natural Body* now in *Heaven*, at the ſame time in this *Holy Sacrament*, but denies nothing of that *Real* and *Spiritual* * *Communion* of it, we have before mentioned; this is indeed our *Doctrine*, nor ſhall we be aſhamed to own it for any *ill Names* he is able to put upon it. But yet I wonder why he ſhould call this *Zuinglianiſm*; ſince if the common name of *Catholick*, or *Chriſtian Doctrine*, be not ſufficient, he might have found out a more ancient Abettor of this

‖ *See* 1. *Treatiſe*, pag. 23. §. xxxii. p. 24. §. xxxii. p. 25. §. xxxvi, xxxvii, *&c.*

* Smalcius de Cœn. Dom. p. 347. Id Diſp. 9. de Hypocr. p. 289. Volkelius lib. iv. cap. 12. p. 304, 319, *&c.* Socinus in Præneſi, c. iv. Sclichtingius diſ. de Cœn. Dom. p. 701.

† Zuingl. *See* de Provid. Dei, cap. 6, *&c.*

* *And this our Author ſeems to inſinuate: See the places above cited. And indeed others have alledged this as the true Opinion of* Zuinglius: *See* Calvin. Tract. de Cœn. Dom. Defenſ. Sacram. Admonit. ad Weſtphal. & Paſſim. alibi. Vid. inſuper libr. de Orthod. Concenſ. c. 7. *And eſpecially* Hoſpin. p. 42, 55. 177, *&c.* Hiſt. Sacr. *Part.* 2.

this *Real Preſence*, than *Zuinglius*, and the truth is, one of the moſt dangerous Oppoſers both of their *Head* and their *Faith* that ever was; I mean St. *Paul*, who has not only clearly expreſs'd himſelf againſt them, as to this Point of the *Euchariſt*, 1 Cor. x. 16. but in moſt of their other Errors left ſuch pernicious Sayings to the World, as all their *Authority* and *Infallibility*, let me add, nor all their *Anathema's* neither, will not be able to overcome.

I ſhall cloſe up this Diſcourſe of the *Real Preſence* acknowledged by us in this Holy *Sacrament*, with a plain familiar Example, and which may ſerve at once both to illuſtrate, and to confirm the Propriety of it. A Father makes his laſt *Will*, and by it bequeaths his *Eſtate* and all the Profits of it to his *Child*. He delivers it into the Hands of his *Son*, and bids him *take* there his *Houſe* and *Lands*, which by this his *laſt Will* he delivers to him. The *Son* in this caſe receives nothing but a *Roll of Parchment*, with a *Seal* tied to it from his *Father*; but yet by virtue of this *Parchment* he is intituled to his *Eſtate*, performing the Conditions of his *Will*, and to all the Benefits and Advantages of it: And in that *Deed* he *truly* and *effectually* received *the very Houſe* and *Lands* that were thereby conveyed to him. Our Saviour Chriſt in like manner, being now about to leave the World, gives this *Holy Sacrament*, as his final *Bequeſt* to us; in it he conveys to us a right to *his Body* and *Blood*, and to all the *Spiritual Bleſſings* and *Graces* that proceed from them. So that as often as we receive this Holy *Euchariſt*, as we ought to do, we receive indeed nothing but a little *Bread* and *Wine* into our *Hands*; but by the *Bleſſing* and *Promiſe* of Chriſt, we by that

Vid. Coſens Hiſt. Tranſubſtantionis, cap. v. §. 5. p. 57.

Bread

Bread and *Wine*, as *really* and *truly* become *Partakers* of Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood*, as the *Son* by the *Will* of his *Father* was made *Inheritor* of his *Eſtate*: Nor is it any more neceſſary for this, that *Chriſt's Body* ſhould come down from *Heaven*, or the outward Elements which we receive, be *ſubſtantially turned* into it, than it is neceſſary in that other caſe, that the very *Houſes* and *Lands* ſhould be given into the Hands of the *Son* to make a *real delivery* or *conveyance* of them; or the *Will* of the *Father* be *truly* and *properly changed* into the very *Nature* and *Subſtance* of them.

PART.

PART II.

CHAPTER III.

Of the Adoration *of the* Hoſt, *as preſcribed and practiſed in the* Church *of* Rome.

WE are now arrived at the laſt Part of this *Diſcourſe*; in which I muſt thus far change the *Method* I purſued in the Other Subject, as to conſider,

Firſt, What the *Doctrine* of the *Church* of *England* as to this Point is; and what our *Adverſaries* Exceptions againſt it are.

Secondly, What is the *Doctrine* of the *Church* of *Rome*; and whether what this *Author* has ſaid in favour of it, may be ſufficient to warrant their *Practice* as to this Matter.

For the former of theſe, *The* Doctrine *of the* Church *of* England, we ſhall need go no farther than the *Rubrick* we have before-mention'd; wherein it is expreſly declared, with reference to this Holy Sacrament, "That no *Adoration* is intended, or "ought to be done, either to the Sacramental *Bread* "and *Wine* there *bodily* received, or to any *Corporal* "*Preſence* of Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood*; For that the "Sacra-

Rubr. at the end of the Communion.

" Sacramental *Bread* and *Wine* remain ſtill in their " very *Natural Subſtances*, and therefore may not be " *adored*, (for that were *Idolatry* to be abhorred of " all Faithful Chriſtians) and the *natural Body* and " *Blood* of our Saviour Chriſt, are in *Heaven*, and " not *here*; it being againſt the truth of Chriſt's " *natural Body*, to be *at One time* in *more places* than " *One*.

This then being ſufficiently cleared, let us ſee what this *Author* has to *obſerve* againſt it.

1. " He ſuppoſes that we will grant, that if there " were a *Corporal Preſence* of Chriſt's *Natural Body* " in this Holy *Sacrament*, then *Kneeling* and *Adoration* " would be here alſo due upon ſuch an Account. Treatiſe 1. Ch. 4. §. 39. p. 27.

He means, that were Chriſt himſelf here in his *Body* actually preſent, He ought to be *adored*; and this he need not doubt of our readineſs to grant.

2. " Tho the *Corporal Preſence* of Chriſt's *Body*, " *i. e.* of its being there *ad modum Corporis*, or clo- " thed with the ordinary Properties of a Body, be de- " ny'd; as it is, not only by the *Engliſh* Divines, " but by the *Lutheran* and *Roman*: Yet let there be " any other manner of *Preſence* (known from Di- " vine Relation) of the very ſame *Body* and " *Blood*; and this as *Real* and *Eſſential*, as if *Corpo-* " *real*; and then I do not ſee but that *Adoration* will " be no leſs due to it *thus*, than *ſo*, Preſent. Ib. §. xl.

Now to this I ſhall at preſent only ſay, That the *Suppoſition* being *abſurd*, do's not admit of a *rational* Conſideration. Thoſe who deny a *bodily Preſence* of Chriſt's *Body* in the Euchariſt, and ask whether *Adoration* may not be paid to his *Body*, which is confeſs'd not to be *bodily preſent* there, ſuppoſing it to be there ſome other way; ought to have no other

ſatiſ-

ſatisfaction than this, that they ſuppoſe an Impoſſibility, a thing which cannot be; and therefore concerning which no reaſonable Anſwer can be given. Some I know have been more free, and allowing for the unreaſonableneſs of the *Suppoſal*, have reſolved contrary to our Author: But I think it veey needleſs to diſpute of the Affections of a *Chimera*; and wrangle about Notions that have neither Uſe nor Exiſtence.

Treatiſe 1. p. 28. §. xli. 3. He *obſerves*, laſtly, "That the *Church* of *Eng-* "*land* hath believed and affirmed ſuch a *Preſence* "(*he means of Chriſt's* Body *in the* Euchariſt) to "which they thought *Adoration* due. I preſume it was then in the Times of *Popery*; for ſince the *Reformation*, I have ſhewn before, that ſhe has always held the contrary. But our Author will prove it, Ibid. and that ſince the *Reformation*; "For, *he ſays*, he "has in his time met with no leſs than five of our "Writers, and thoſe of no mean Account neither, "that have been of this Opinion. This indeed is a very notable way of proving the *Doctrine* of our *Church*: But what now if I ſhould bring him *fifteen Others* that have deny'd it; then I hope the *Doctrine* of the *Church* of *England* may be as fair for the contrary. But we will examine his Evidence.

Treatiſe 1. §. xlii. p. 28. Firſt; "Biſhop *Andrews*, he ſays, declares, that "tho we *adore* not the *Sacrament*, yet we adore *Chriſt* "in and with the *Sacrament*, beſides and without the "*Sacrament*: and aſſures the World, that K. *James* "looked upon Chriſt to be *truly preſent*, and *truly* "to be *adored* in it. How this *Biſhop* thought Chriſt *trul preſent* in the *Sacrament* we have ſeen before; and may from thence eaſily conclude how he ſuppoſed he might be *adored* there: *viz.* As in all other

Holy

Holy Offices, in which we confeſs Him by his *Divine Power* to be *preſent* with us, but eſpecially in this *Sacred Myſtery*. And thus we all *adore* him, both in and with, and without the *Sacrament*; we confeſs him to be *truly preſent*, and therefore *truly* to be *adored* by us. But now for Chriſt's *Natural Body*, (of which, and not of Chriſt himſelf, our Diſpute is) if that be any otherwiſe *truly preſent* than as we before ſhew'd, let it be remembred, that according to this *Biſhop*, it muſt not be his *Glorified Body*, his *Body* as it now is; but his *Body Crucified*, his *Body* as *offer'd for us*, and in the *State of his Death*; ſo He expreſly affirms; and this I believe our *Author* himſelf will confeſs in his Senſe to be impoſſible.

See above, pag. 62.

His next Witneſs is Biſhop *Taylor*: " We *worſhip*, " He means, ſays this Author, the *Body*, or the *Fleſh* " of Chriſt [in the Euchariſt]. But is he ſure the Biſhop meant ſo? If he be, I am ſure the Biſhop thought we all of us committed *Idolatry* in ſo doing. For being conſulted, as we have ſeen above, " whe- " ther without all danger of *Idolatry* we may not " render *Divine Worſhip* to our Bleſſed *Saviour* as " preſent in the Bleſſed *Sacrament* or *Hoſt*, accor- " ding to his *Human Nature* in that *Hoſt*? He expreſly declares, " We may not render Divine Wor- " ſhip to Him as preſent in the Bleſſed *Sacrament*, " according to his *Human Nature*, without danger " of *Idolatry*, becauſe he is not there according to his " *Humane Nature*; and therefore you give *Divine* " *Worſhip* to a *Non Ens*, which muſt needs be *Ido-* " *latry*. And indeed this our Author knew very well was his Opinion, who himſelf in his next Treatiſe, cites the xiiith Section of his *Real Preſence*, which was written on purpoſe to prove the unlawfulneſs

Treatiſe 1. §. xliii. p. 28.

See Polemical Diſcourſes, 5. *Letter, at the end*, p.

Treatiſe 2. p. 9. §. vi. n. 7.

fulneſs of worſhipping Chriſt's *Body* in this *Sacrament*. But *diſſimulation* of other Mens Opinions in matter of Religion, is perhaps as lawful on ſome Occaſions, as if it were their *own*: And why may not an *Author* prevaricate the *Doctrine* of his *Adverſary* in defence of the *Catholick Faith*, ſince I have read of a * *Proteſtant* Miniſter, who in the Troubles of *France* being brought over to the King's Intereſt, was ſecretly reconciled to the *Church* of *Rome*, and permitted ſo far to diſſemble his own Opinion, as not only to continue in the outward profeſſion of the *Proteſtant Religion*, but even to exerciſe the Functions of his *Miniſtry* as before; and that by the expreſs leave of his *Holineſs*, for three whole Years, the better to carry on the *Catholick Cauſe* in betraying the Secrets, and managing the Debates of his Brethren.

* *The Story was publiſh'd in the Memoirs of Monſieur* D'eageant, *printed with permiſſion at* Grenoble, 1668. pag. 246. *I will ſet it down in his own Words.*

Il'y avoit deja quelque tems que D'eageant avoit gagné l'un des Miniſtres de la Province de Laugeddoc, qui etoit des plus employez aux Affaires & menees de ceux de la R. P. R. & en l'Eſtime particuliare de Monſieur de Lesdiguiers. Il avoit meme ſecrettement moyenné ſa Converſion; & obtenu un Bref de Rome, portant qu'encore qu'il eut etè receu au giron de l'Egliſe, il luy etoit permis de continuer ſon Miniſtere durant 3 Ans, pourveu qu'en ſes preches il ne dit rien de contraire à la creance de la vraye Egliſe, & qu'il ne celebrât point la cene. Le Bref fût obtenu, afinque le Miniſtre pût eſtre continué dans les Emplois qu'il avoit, & decouvrir les menees qui ſe faiſoient dans le Royaume.

As for Biſhop *Forbes*, and the Arch-biſhop of *Spalatto*, it is not to be wondred if Men that had entertained the Deſign of *reconciling all Parties*, were forced to ſtrain ſometimes a little farther than was fit for the doing of it. And for Mr. *Thorndyke*, we have ſeen that his Notion of the *Real Preſence* was particular, and widely different both from theirs and ours; and therefore that we are not to anſwer for the Conſequences of it. But however, to quit

theſe

these just Exceptions against them: Will he himself allow every thing to be the *Doctrine* or not of the *Church* of *Rome*, which I shall bring him three of their *Authors* to affirm or deny? If he will, then *Transubstantiation* is not their *Doctrine*, for I have already quoted above twice three of their most Learned Men against it. To *adore* an *Unconsecrated Host* by mistake, is *Idolatry*; for so St. *Thomas*, *Paludanus*, *Catharine*, and others, assure us: To worship the *Host*, supposing their Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* false, a worser *Idolatry* than any Heathens were ever guilty of; so several of their Writers confess. But now if our Author will not allow this to be good *arguing* against them, with what reason do's he go about to urge it against us?

Secondly; We must in the next place consider what the *Doctrine* of the *Church* of *Rome* as to this *Point* is; and whether what this *Author* has advanced in favour of it, may be sufficient to warrant their *practice* of this *Adoration*.

For the Doctrine of the *Church* of *Rome*, I find it thus clearly set down by the *Council of Trent*: "There can be no doubt, but that all the Faithful of "Christ, after the manner that has ever been re- "ceived in the *Catholick Church*, ought to give that "*Supream Worship* which is due to the *true God*, to "his *Holy Sacrament*. For it is nevertheless to be "*adored*, because it was instituted by our Lord

Concil. Trid. Sess. xiii. cap. 5. p. 57. Nullus itaq; dubitandi locus relinquitur, quin omnes Christi fideles pro more in Catholicâ Ecclesiâ semper recepto Latriæ cultum, qui Vero Deo debetur, huic Sanctissimo *Sacramento* in veneratione exhibeant. Neq; enim ideò minùs est Adorandum quòd fuerit à Christo D. ut sumatur institutum: Nam illum eundem Deum præsentem *IN EO* adesse Credimus, quem Pater æternus introducens in Orbem Terrarum, dicit; *Et adorent eum omnis Angeli Dei.* Hebr. I.

" Chriſt that it might be *received*; Foraſmuch as " we believe the *ſame God* to be preſent *in it*, of " whom the Eternal Father when he brought him " into the World, ſaid, *And let all the Angels of God* " *worſhip him.* That therefore, according to this *Council*, is to be *worſhipped*, which Chriſt *inſtituted* to be *received*; and *in which* they believe *Chriſt* to be *preſent*: But 'tis no other than the *Holy Sacrament*, as theſe *Trent*-Fathers here expreſly and properly ſtile it; which we all confeſs Chriſt *inſtituted* to be *received*, and *in which* they ſuppoſe *Chriſt* to be *preſent*: And therefore 'tis the *Sacrament* which is to be *adored.* Which reaſoning I find Card. *Pallavicini* thus improving in his Hiſtory of this *Council*: " It " is well known, *ſays he*, that to make a *Whole Ado-* " *rable* with the *Supream Adoration*, it is ſufficient " that *One part* of that Whole merits ſuch a *Wor-* " *ſhip.* This he illuſtrates in the Example of Chriſt's *Humanity*; and thence concludes, " How " then ought we not in like manner to *adore* this *Sa-* " *crament* which is a *Whole*, that contains as its prin- " cipal part *the Body of Chriſt?*

Card. Pallavicino Iſtoria del Concilio di Trento: parte ſecunda, l. 12. c. 7. pag. 298.

Ora è notiſſimo, che, acciòche un Tutto s'adori con adarazione di Latria, baſta che una parte di quel tutto meriti queſto culto. ——Come dunque non douremo parimente adorare queſto Sacramento, il quale è un Tutto che contiene come parte principale il Corpo di Chriſto.

It is thorefore, as I conceive, the undoubted *Doctrine* of the *Church* of *Rome*, that the Holy *Sacrament* of the *Euchariſt*, for the Reaſon here given, is to be *adored*, with that *Supream Adoration that is due to the true God.*

Now to warrant their *Practice* in this Matter, our Author thus proceeds in proof of it:

I. He

I. He premiſes ſome Propoſitions, which he calls, *Proteſtant Conceſſions.* *Anſwer to his ſecond* Diſcourſe.

II. Some others, which he ſtiles, *Catholick Aſſertions.* And then,

III. Goes on to ſhew what warrant they have for that Belief on which this *Adoration* is founded.

I ſhall diſtinctly follow him in every one of theſe.

In his firſt Part, which he calls, *Proteſtant Conceſſions*, I will go on with him thus far: I. Part, *Proteſtant Conceſſions.*

1*ſt.* * " That Supream and Divine *Adoration* is " due to our Lord and Saviour *Jeſus Chriſt.* * §. I. pag. 1.

2*dly*, † " That where-ever the *Body* of our *Lord* " now is, there muſt alſo his *whole Perſon* be. † Ibid. §. II.

" And therefore, 3*dly*, ‖ That where-ever *Chriſt*'s " *Body* is *truly* and *really preſent*, there his *Divine* " *Perſon* is *ſupreamly adorable.* ‖ Ibid. §. III.

But now for his next Aſſertion; * " That it is " affirmed by many *Proteſtants*, eſpecially thoſe of " the *Church* of *England*, that this *Body* and *Blood* of " our Lord is *really preſent*, not only in *Virtue*, but " in *Subſtance* in the *Euchariſt.* † If he means, as in his former *Treatiſe* he explain'd himſelf, that the *very natural Body* of Chriſt, that *Body* that was *born of the Virgin*, and *crucified on the Croſs*, and is *now* in *Heaven*, is alſo as to *its Subſtance truly and really* preſent on *Earth*, in the Holy *Euchariſt*, or to the *worthy Receiver*: I have in the foregoing *Chapter* fully ſhewn this *new Fancy* to be neither the *Doctrine* of * §. V. n. 1. p. 2. † *See* Treatiſe 1. p. 5. §. 7.

the

the *Church* of *England*, nor the Opinion of thoſe very *Writers* whom he produces for proof of it. And as to the || *Adoration* of it upon any ſuch account, I have juſt now declared his Miſtake of them in that Point too. And I ſhall not follow our Author's ill Example in repeating it all over again.

|| Diſc. 2. p. 8. §. vi. n. 1.

For his * fifth Remark, " That the *Lutherans* " affirm that *Chriſt's Body* and *Blood* are *preſent*, not " only to the worthy *Communicants*, but to the *Con-* " *ſecrated Symbols*, and whilſt ſo preſent, which is " during the Action of the Lord's Supper (*i. e.* ſays " he, as I conceive them from the *Conſecration*, till " the end of the *Communion*) are to be *Adored*. I anſwer; Firſt, As to the former part, it is confeſs'd that the *Lutherans* do indeed ſuppoſe Chriſt to be preſent, not only to the *worthy Communicants*, but alſo to the *Conſecrated Symbols*. But now, ſecondly, for the other part, that during the *Action of the Lord's Supper*, *He is* to *be Adored there*; this is not ſo certain. For, 1. I do not find any thing eſtabliſh'd amongſt them as to this matter, neither in the *Confeſſion* of *Auxpourg*, nor in any other *publick Acts* of their *Church*. 2. I find ſeveral of their Divines utterly denying, that *Chriſt's Body* is to be *Adored* in the *Holy Sacrament*; and our * *Author* himſelf confeſſes it. Tho now, 3. † I will not deny but that ſome others of them do allow, if not that *Chriſt's Body*, yet that *Chriſt* himſelf is to be *Adored* after a peculiar manner in the *Action* of the *Lord's Supper*; and as far as I conceive, do by the Action mean, as our Author here repreſents it, from the *Conſecration* to the end of the *Communion*. So that then, with this Limitation, his Propoſition I preſume may be admitted; " That the *Lutherans* do acknowledg,

* §. vii. p. 10.

* *See below*, Diſc. 2. p. 16.

† Conrad. Schluſſelburgius, Catal. Hæret. l. 3. arg. 45. p. 205. Item Arg. 103. p. 280. It. arg. 174. p. 327. Francof. 1605. *And* Hoſpinian *quotes it of* Luther *himſelf, that it was his Opinion*, Concord. diſcor. p. 358. n. 16. Genev. 1678.

" that

" that Chriſt is preſent during the Action of the " Lord's Supper; and therefore it is by ſeveral of " them ſuppoſed, that he ought to be *adored* in it.

As to the ſixth and laſt *Conceſſion*, which he draws from Monſier *Daille's Apologie*, " That tho we do " not our ſelves believe the *Real Preſence* of Chriſt's " *Body* in the *Signs*, yet neither do we eſteem the " belief of it ſo criminal, as to obliege us to break off " *Communion* with all thoſe that hold it; and there- " fore, that had the *Roman Church* no other Error " but this, that it would not have given us any ſuffi- " cient cauſe of ſeparation from it: we are ready to admit it; always ſuppoſing that the belief of it had not been preſs'd upon us neither, as a neceſſary *Article of Communion*; nor any *Anathema* pronounced againſt us for not receiving it. And for the other part of it which he ſubjoyns, " That a Diſciple " giving Divine Honour, upon miſtake, to another " Perſon, much reſembling our Saviour Chriſt, " would have been no *Idolater*; from whence he would infer, " That therefore allowing a *Conſecrated* " *Hoſt* to be truly *Adorable*, a Perſon that ſhould by " miſtake adore an *unconſecrated One*, would not be " guilty of *Idolatry*. We are content to allow it; tho what uſe he can make of it in this *Controvery*, unleſs againſt his own Brethren, St. *Thomas*, *Paludauus*, and others, I do not underſtand; ſince he knows we utterly deny any *Hoſt*, *conſecrated* or *not*, to be fit to be *worſhipped*. And this may ſerve for his firſt Foundation of *Proteſtant Conceſſions*; which were they every one as certain as his firſt is, that *Chriſt is to be adored*, I cannot ſee what his Cauſe would gain by it; and he has not by any *Application* of them in this *Treatiſe*, given us the leaſt reaſon to think that they

§. vi. p. 10, 11.

Ibid. pag. 11.

are

are of any moment in it. But ſome Men have a peculiar Faculty of amuſing the World with nothing: and I remember, I once heard a judicious and modeſt Man give this *Character* of an Author much reſembling ours, with reference to his *Guide in Controverſy*, that for a *Book* which carried a great appearance of *Reaſoning*, it had the leaſt in it of any he ever met with. But I go on,

2. Part. Catholick Aſſertions.

II. To his *Catholick Aſſertions.*

Pag. 13. §. ix.

And firſt: " *Catholicks* (as he calls them) affirm " in the *Euchariſt* after the *Conſecration*, a *Sign*, or " *Symbol* to remain ſtill diſtinct, and having a divers " *Exiſtence* from that of the *Thing ſignified*, or from " Chriſt's *Body* contained in or under it. This 'tis true the *Papiſts*, or if you pleaſe, the *Catholicks* do affirm; becauſe that otherwiſe they could not call it a *Sacrament*. But now, if we enquire what that which they *call a Sign*, or a *Symbol* in this Holy *Sacrament* is, we ſhall find it to be neither ſuch as our Bleſſed Saviour eſtabliſh'd, nor indeed any thing that can in propriety of Speech be ſo termed.

For our Saviour Chriſt, 'tis evident that the *Symbols* inſtituted by him, were *Bread* and *Wine*: They were theſe that he *took* and *bleſſed*, and *gave* to his *Diſciples*; and commanded them alſo in like manner to *take*, and *bleſs*, and *give to others* in *remembrance of him*; and as the *Symbols* of his *Body* and *Blood* in this *Holy Euchariſt*. But now for the *Papiſts*; they deſtroy the *Bread* and the *Wine*; they leave only a few aiery, empty *Species*, that is, appearances of ſomething, but which are really nothing, have no *ſubſtance* to ſupport them.

The

The *Symbols* eſtabliſh'd by Chriſt were *Feſtival Symbols*, a matter apt for our *Corporal Nouriſhment*; to ſignify to us, that as by them, *viz.* by *Bread* and *Wine*, our *Bodies* are nouriſhed to a *Corporal Life*; ſo by the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt, which they both *repreſent* and *communicate to us*, our Souls are fed to *Life Everlaſting*. But for that which hath no *Subſtance*, *i. e.* nothing which can be converted into our *Bodily Nouriſhment*; how that can be a *Symbol* of this *Spiritual Food*, I do not very well underſtand. Indeed our Author tells us, "That though after Conſe- Pag. 14. §. x. "cration, the *Subſtance* of the *Bread* and *Wine* is de- "ny'd to remain, yet is *Subſtance* here taken in ſuch "a ſenſe, as that neither the *hardneſs*, nor the *ſoft-* "*neſs*, nor the *frangibility*, nor the *ſavour*, nor the "*odour*, nor the *nutritive virtue* of *Bread*, nor no- "thing *viſible* or *tangible*, or otherwiſe *perceptible* by "any *Senſe*, is involved in it: That is to ſay, that the *Symbol* or *external Sign* then in this Euchariſt, is according to them, a *hard*, *ſoft*, *frangible*, *guſtible*, *odoriferous*, *nutritive*, *viſible*, *tangible*, *perceptible nothing*. Verily a fit *external Species* indeed to contain, a *one*, *manifold*; *viſible*, *inviſible*; *extended*, *unextended*; *local*, *illocal*; *abſent*, *preſent*; *natural*, *ſupernatural*; *corporal*, *ſpiritual Body*.

Secondly; Concerning the *Adoration* of the *Sacrament*, he tells us, "That this word *Sacrament*, is Pag. 14. §. xi. "not to be taken always in the ſame ſenſe; but "ſometimes to be uſed to ſignify only the *external* "*Sign*, or *Symbols*; ſometimes only the *Res Sacra-* "*menti*, or the thing contain'd under them, which "is the more principal part thereof. This indeed is a ſort of new Divinity. I always thought hitherto, that when we talked of a *Sacrament*, properly ſo

called, we had meant an *outward and viſible Sign of an inward and ſpiritual Grace:* and that this particular *Sacrament* had been a whole compoſed of the *External Speices*, (whatever they are) as the *Sign*; and the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt as the *inward part*, or *thing ſignified*. Thus I am ſure the *Catechiſm* of the *Council* of *Trent* inſtructs us: Firſt, for the name; it tells us, that "*The Latin Doctors have thought* "*that certain Signs, ſubjected to the Senſes, which de-* "*clare, and as it were ſet before the Eyes, the Grace* "*which they effect, may fitly be called Sacraments.* And for the *nature* of them, thus it defines a *Sacrament* from S. *Auſtin*, "It is the *ſign* of a *holy thing*; or more fully, as I before ſaid; *a viſible ſign of an in-* "*viſible Grace, inſtituted for our Juſtification.* So that neither then *the Symbols* alone, nor the *inviſible part*, or *Grace alone*, can with any manner of *propriety* be called a *Sacrament*; but the *Sign* referr'd to the *Grace*; and as it is the *Symbol* inſtituted by Chriſt for the *conferring* of it.

Catech. ad Parach. part 2. de Sacram. n. iii, & v. p. 92.

This therefore can with no good reaſon be called a *Catholick Aſſertion*; being neither *general* nor *true*: But however, ſince he ſeems content to allow it to be an *impropriety of Speech*, and that, I confeſs, the *Catechiſm* of the *Council* of *Trent* does lead him into it; let us ſee what uſe he can make of it. †"And "as Proteſtants much preſs, ſo *Catholicks (Roman* "*Catholicks)* willingly acknowledg a great diffe-"rence between theſe two, The worſhipping of the "*Sacrament*, as this word is taken for the *Symbols*; "and the worſhipping of *Chriſt's Body* in the *Sacra-* "*ment*. There is, no doubt, a *great difference* between *thoſe two*: but then they who tell us, the *Sacrament* is to be *Adored*, if they will ſpeak *rationally*, muſt

* Catec. Conc. Trid. part 2. de Euch. §. viii. nota p. 144.

† Pag. 15. §. xi.

muſt mean neither the *one* nor *other* of theſe, but the *Hoſt*; that is, as Card. *Pallavicini* expounds it, The *whole*, of which *Chriſt's Body is a part*; in the language of the *Council of Trent*; the *Sacrament* IN WHICH they believe *Chriſt* to be *preſent*, and for that *Cauſe adore* it; as the Cardinal again argues; * that, *To make a Whole Adorable, it is ſufficient that one part be ſo; and therefore ſince the Body of Chriſt is adorable, the Sacrament for its ſake is to be worſhipped.* It is therefore a meer ſhift to tell us that the *Sacrament* is to be *adored*; *i. e. Chriſt's Body* in the *Sacrament*. Nor will the remark of our Author help us out, that tho the *Chapter* indeed calls it the *Sacrament* IN WHICH *is Chriſt's Body*, yet the *Canon* ſpeaks more *preciſely*, and calls it *Chriſt in the Sacrament*; unleſs he ſuppoſes the *Council* to have been *infallible* in the *Canons* only, and not in the *Chapters*; as ſome have thought, that they may be out in their *Proofs*, but cannot be in their *Concluſions*. But however, ſince he ſo much deſires it, for my part I ſhall be content to allow them this too; for I ſhould be glad by any means to ſee them ſenſible of their Errors. But yet ſo as that it be eſteem'd only a *private Opinion this*, not a *Catholick Aſſertion*.

* *See above*, pag. 91, 92.

Pag. 16. §. xiii.

Thirdly; *Catholicks*, he means the *Papiſts* ſtill, "ground their *Adoration*, not upon *Tranſubſtantiati-* "*on*; as if *Tranſubſtantiation* defeated, *Adoration* is "ſo too; but on a *Real Preſence* with the *Symbols*, "which in general is agreed on by the *Lutherans* to- "gether with them. By which Aſſertion, if he means only to make this Diſcovery, That Chriſt's *Real Preſence*, together with the *Subſtance* of the *Bread* and *Wine*, is in his Opinion as good a ground for *Adoration*, as if he were there only with the

P. 21. §. xvii.

Spieces of the *Bread*, the *Subſtance* being changed into his *Body*; I have no more to ſay to it. But if he would hereby make us believe, that 'tis all one whether Chriſt be *adored*, as ſuppoſed here by the *Lutherans* in this Holy *Euchariſt*, and as imagined there by the *Papiſts*; I muſt then deny his *Aſſertion*; and deſire him to keep home to his own *manner of Real Preſence*, and which I ſhall preſently convince him, will leave them in a much worſe condition than their Neighbours, whom he would draw into the ſame Snare with them. And therefore, whereas he concludes,

P. 22. §. xviii. Fourthly; "That ſuppoſing *Tranſubſtantiation* "to be an *Error*, yet if the Tenent of *Corporal* or *Real* "*Preſence* (as held by the *Lutherans*, or others) be "true; *Catholicks* (he would ſay *Papiſts*) plead "their *Adoration*, is no way fruſtrated, but ſtill "warrantable: I muſt tell him, that the *Adoration* of thoſe among the *Lutherans*, who worſhip Chriſt in this Sacrament upon the account of his *Real Preſence* in, or with the *Bread*, tho it be an Error, yet is infinitely more excuſable than theirs, who ſuppoſe the *Bread* to be turned into Chriſt's *Body*; and becauſe it may not be thought that I ſpeak this out of any prejudice againſt them, I will here offer my Reaſons for it.

1*ſt*, They that *adore Chriſt* as *really preſent*, together with the *Bread*, do no violence to their *Senſes*: They confeſs, that what they *ſee*, and *taſte*, and *feel*, and *ſmell*, is *really* Bread and *Wine*. Whilſt the *Papiſt* in denying the *Bread* and *Wine* to remain; or that what he *ſees*, and *feels*, and *ſmells*, and *taſtes*, is what all the World perceives and knows it is, contradicts his *Senſes*, and in them the *Law* of *Nature*, that

that Means which God has given us to *direct* and *lead* us into the ſearch of *Truth*; and by Conſequence errs againſt infinitely greater Means of *Conviction*, and ſo is more inexcuſable than the Other.

2dly; They who worſhip Chriſt, as ſuppoſing Him to be together with the *Bread* in this *Holy Euchariſt*, are erroneous indeed in this, that they take Chriſt's *Body* to be where really it is not; but yet their Object is undoubtedly right, and in that they are not miſtaken. But now for the *Papiſt*; he *adores*, 'tis confeſs'd, what he thinks to be Chriſt's *Body*; and would not otherwiſe *adore* it: But yet ſtill 'tis the *Hoſt* that he *adores*, the Subſtance that is under thoſe *Species* which he ſees; and which if it be not Chriſt, but meer *Subſtance* of *Bread*, the Caſe is vaſtly alter'd between the *Lutheran* and *Him*. The former *adores Chriſt*, only as in a place where he is not; the latter not only do's this, but moreover *adores* a *Subſtance* for Chriſt which is not his *Body* and *Blood*, but a meer *Creature* of *Bread* and *Wine*.

Monſieur *Daille* therefore might rightly enough ſay of a *Lutheran*, "that his *Adoration* is miſtaken, "not in this—— that it addreſſeth it ſelf to an *Object* "not *adorable*, but only that by Error it ſeeks and "thinks to enjoy it in a place where it is not; and ſo "becomes only *vain* and *unprofitable*: And yet our Author has no manner of Reaſon from thence to pretend, that a *Papiſt* who terminates his *Adoration* upon a *Subſtance* which *really* is not Chriſt's *Body*, but only miſtaken by him to be ſo, ſhall be in the ſame Condition: there being an apparently vaſt difference between worſhipping Chriſt in a place where he is not, and worſhipping that for Chriſt which really P. 23. §. xix.

really is not Chriſt, but only a created *Subſtance.*

And this in truth our Author ſeems to have been ſenſible of, and therefore thinks to evade it, by ſaying,

Ibid. p. 23. "That they do not worſhip the *Subſtance* that is in "that *place*, under ſuch *Accidents* WHATEVER IT BE, "(which if *Bread* ſhould happen to be there, he "confeſſes would make them *Bread-worſhippers*) but "they worſhip it only upon SUPPOSITION that it is "*Chriſt's Body*, and not *Bread.*

Well, be this ſo: But what now if they are miſtaken in their *Suppoſition*: They worſhip, he confeſſes, the *Subſtance* that is under thoſe *Accidents*, ſuppoſing it to be Chriſt's *Body*; but ſtill, miſtaken or not, that *Subſtance* which is under thoſe Species, whatever it be, they do worſhip: And if they have, as he thinks, a *rational ground* for this *Suppoſition*, which we ſhall ſee by and by, yet this will only excuſe them from being *formal Idolaters*; but will not hinder but that their Worſhip is ſtill directed to an *undue Object*, if that which is under the *Species* be indeed but *Bread*, and not Chriſt's *Body* as they imagine. And this then may ſerve to argue the falſeneſs of what he lays down as his.

P. 22. §. xix. Fifth, *Catholick Aſſertion*: "That ſuppoſing both "the *Lutherans* and *Papiſts* miſtaken in their Opi-"nion, yet there can be no pretence why the One "ſhould not be as excuſable as the others. Since as I have ſaid; 1*ſt*, They err more groſly in abandoning the conviction of their *Senſes*, which the *Lutherans* do not; 2*dly*, They worſhip a *Subſtance* for *Chriſt*, which really is not: To which if this be not enough, I will add yet two other Reaſons: 3*dly*, That they make the *Conſecration*, without which

which Chriſt is not preſent upon their own Principles, to depend on ſuch uncertainties (as I ſhall more fully ſhew anon) that they can never be ſure that Chriſt is there, which the *Lutherans* are free from: And laſtly; They *Anathematize* thoſe who diſſent from them as to this *Point*, and ſo make a *Schiſm* in dividing the *Unity of the Church*, which the *Lutherans* are ſo far from doing, that they neither eſtabliſh any Doctrine of *Adoration* at all, nay many of them do not believe it; and upon occaſion, freely *communicate* with thoſe who diſſent from them in their belief, both of their way of the *Real Preſence*, and of the *Adoration*. And for the ſame reaſon I cannot totally aſſent to his.

Sixth Aſſertion: "That ſuppoſing there be no "ſuch *Real Preſence* as either of them believes, yet "that their *adoration* of Chriſt, who is a true *Object* "of *Supreme Adoration*, and only by them miſtaken "to be in ſome *place* where He is not, cannot be "termed any ſuch *Idolatry*, as is the *worſhipping* of "an *Object* not at all *adorable*. P. 25. §. xxi.

This as to what concerns thoſe of the *Lutherans* who adore Chriſt in the Sacrament, is true: But for the *Papiſt* it is not. He intends, I allow it, to worſhip Chriſt, but he miſtakes an *Object* for *Chriſt*, which is only a piece of *Bread*. He worſhips his *Hoſt*, ſuppoſing it to be our *Saviour's Body*, but his Error is groſs, and he not only miſtakes Chriſt to be in a place where he is not, but he miſtakes that to be Chriſt which indeed is not, but only a *ſimple Wafer*. His Worſhip therefore is not like the *Manichees* worſhipping of Chriſt in the *Sun*; but rather as if the *Manichee* ſhould, from ſome miſtaken grounds, have fancy'd the *Sun* it ſelf to be turned into

into Chriſt's *Body*; and then in defiance of all *Scripture*, *Senſe*, and *Reaſon*, ſhould have fallen down before it; but with a *good Intention* not to *adore* the *Sun*, but the *Body* of our Bleſſed Lord under the *Spieces* or *Accidents* of the *Sun*. This is the true *Parallel*; only that herein ſtill the *Manichee* would have been the more excuſable of the two, by how much the *Sun* is a more likely Object to be miſtaken for Chriſt's *glorified Body* than *a Morſel of Bread*; and leſs capable of being diſcovered by our *Senſes* and *Examination* not to be ſo.

It remains then, that theſe *Lutherans* only *adore* Chriſt where he is not; the *Papiſts* not only do this, but more-over they *adore* that for *Chriſt* which *really is not*, but a meer *created Subſtance*. Both the One and the Other are Erroneous; but the Papiſt's Miſtake, renders him at the leaſt guilty of *material Idolatry*, whereas the *Lutheran*'s is only an undue Application of his Worſhip as to the *Place*, but right as to the *Perſon*. Let us ſee,

Seventhly; How far their Miſtake will excuſe them, in anſwer to his *ſeventh Aſſertion*: "That how-
P. 26. §. xxii. "ever a *Manichæan* may be guilty of *Idolatry* for "worſhipping Chriſt in the Sun; and an *Iſraelite* "for worſhipping God as ſpecially reſident in the "*Claves* of *Dan* and *Bethel*, becauſe it is *adoring* a "Fancy of their own, without any *rational Ground* "or *Pretence* thereof; and however meerly a *good* "*Intention*, grounded upon a *culpable Ignorance*, can "excuſe none from *Idolatry*, or any other Fault; yet "if *Catholicks*, (*i. e.* the pretended Roman Catho-"licks) can produce a *rational Ground* of their ap-"prehending Chriſt *preſent* in the *Euchariſt*, tho "poſſibly miſtaken in it, they are to be ex-

"cuſed

" excuſed from *Idolatry*. Which Propoſal is ſo juſt, that I am very willing to allow it; and ſhall be heartily glad that the *Grounds* of their *Miſtake* may in the End prove to have been ſo *reaſonable* as to excuſe them. But then it muſt be remembred too, that he confeſſes if theſe *Grounds* be not *reaſonable*, but as he ſays of the *Manichees*, their *adoring of the Hoſt* be indeed an *adoring* a *Fancy* of their own without any *rational Ground*; So that their ignorance in this Matter is culpable, then by their own allowance their are *Idolaters*.

This therefore brings me to the laſt Thing to be enquired into.

III. What *Grounds* they have for this *Adoration?* and whether they be ſuch as, ſhould they be miſtaken in it, will be ſufficient to excuſe them?

And thus after a great deal of *Preamble*, but very little to the purpoſe, we are at laſt come to the main *Queſtion*. I have already ſo largely ſhewn our Reaſons againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*, or that *Real Preſence* on which this *Adoration* is built, that I ſhall not need to inſiſt here. Yet becauſe the ſtreſs of this *Controverſy* depends principally on this laſt Part, I will,

1*ſt*, Examine the ſtrength of thoſe *Grounds* which this *Author* has offer'd, to warrant their *Adoration*.

2*dly*, I will propoſe an Argument or two upon their own allowed *Principles* againſt it.

But before we proceed to theſe Points, we muſt
Pag. 26. §. xxiii. yet have one touch more upon the old String: " For
" the *Lutherans*, *he ſays*, being allow'd to have ſuch
" a plauſible *Ground* or Motive for their *Adoration*,
" whereby they become Abſolved by other Prote-
" ſtants from *Idolatry*, in *adoring* our Lord as pre-
" ſent there, I ſee not why the *Grounds* of *Roman*
" *Catholicks* ſhould be any whit leſs valued than
" theirs.

In Anſwer to which, the *Reader* may pleaſe to remember, that I have before ſaid, that we do not excuſe thoſe *Lutherans* who do this ſo much upon this Principle, that they have a more *plauſible Ground* or *Motive* for their *Adoration*; but for this rather, that confeſſing the *Subſtance* of the *Bread* to remain, they do not miſtake their *Object*, but pay their *Adoration* indeed to *Chriſt*, only ſuppoſing him to be there where in Truth he is not. But, *2dly*, this Author is very much miſtaken if he thinks the *Lutherans* have no better a Foundation for their *Real*
So Ibid. *Preſence* than the *Papiſts*. Indeed, were the difference no greater than between a *Con* and a *Trans*, it would, I confeſs, be haedly worth the while to contend about it. But when we come to the Point it ſelf, we may obſerve theſe four Advantages, among many others of the *Lutherans* ſide. 1. They confeſs for the outward *Elements*, that they are *really* what they appear to be, *Bread* and *Wine*: and ſo they do no *Violence* to their *Senſes*; which, as I have ſaid, is a great *aggravation* againſt the *Papiſts*. 2. By this means they are at no defiance with all thoſe Texts of Scripture where they are ſo often called *Bread* and *Wine* after *Conſecration*: All which the *Papiſt* contradicts, but the *Lutheran* does not. 3. From the Words of

Chriſt,

Chriſt, *This is my Body*; we all of us confeſs may be inferr'd, that *Chriſt's Body* is in this Holy *Sacrament*: But whence do's the *Papiſt* infer the deſtruction of the *Subſtance* of the *Bread*; ſo that what is *taken*, and *bleſſed*, and *given*, is not *Bread*, but Chriſt's *Body* under the appearance of *Bread*? This is an Error which I am ſure the Text gives no manner of colour to; and therefore our Author cannot with any reaſon pretend, as he do's, whether we conſult the Text of Holy *Scripture*, or our own *Senſes*, that they have as good *grounds* for their *Real Preſence*, as the *Lutherans* have for theirs. To all which let me add, *4thly*, that by *Tranſubſtantiation* they deſtroy the very Nature of a *Sacrament*, by leaving no true external *Sign* or *Symbol*, and which is another unanſwerable Argument againſt them, whilſt the *Lutherans* acknowledging the *Subſtance* of the *Bread* to remain, do not deſtroy at all the Nature of this *Sacrament*, but retain the ſame *Sign* which our Bleſſed Lord eſtabliſhed, and ſo have no Objection on this ſide neither to convict them.

But yet notwithſtanding all this, "Do not ſome "of our Writers confeſs, that the *Papiſts* Interpre- "tation is more rational than the *Lutherans*? I Anſwer; What certain *Proteſtants* may have ſaid in Zeal for their own Opinions, and in particular *Hoſpinian* upon the account of his Maſter *Zuinglius*, I cannot tell; But ſure I am, we are not bound to anſwer for all that any *Proteſtant* Author has ſaid. And if theſe Reaſons I have here given for the contrary are valid, they ought to be more regarded, than the ungrounded Aſſertions of a *Sacramentary* Hiſtorian. Pag. 26, 27.

Pag. 27. Well, but ſtill the "*Papiſt* do's not ground his *Ado-*
"*ration* upon *Tranſubſtantiation*, but on *Corporal Pre-*
"*ſence*; and ſo they muſt *both* be excuſed, or neither.

This is a fetch to very little purpoſe: For let me ask this Author: He confeſſes he founds his *Adoration* upon the *Corporal Preſence*: Do's he believe the *Corporal Preſence* in the way of *Tranſubſtantiation* excluſive to all others, or no? If he do's, then 'tis evident that the *Corporal Preſence* and *Tranſubſtantiation*, muſt with him ſtand or fall together; and ſo if he *adores* on the account of the *Corporal Preſence*, he do's it upon the account of *Tranſubſtantiation*. If he do's not believe this, 'tis plain he is no *Papiſt*, nor ſubmits to the *Authority* of the *Church* of *Rome*, which has defined the *Corporal Preſence* to be after this particular manner, excluſive to all Others, and *Anathematized* all that dare to deny it.

Laying aſide therefore this Compariſon, *and which*
Pag. 27. §. xxiv. *in truth will do them but very little kindneſs*: "Let us
"view more particularly what rational Grounds they
"have to exhibit for this their belief of their *Corporal*
"*Preſence* of Chriſt in the *Euchariſt*, and of the *Ado-*
"*ration* of him upon that account.

Ibid. I. *Ground*: And the firſt is *Divine Revelation*: For which our Author offers the two uſual Inſtances, of the *Words of Inſtitution*, and the *6th Chapter of St. John*; both which therefore I have at large diſcourſed on above, and I believe ſufficiently ſhewn how falſe a Foundation theſe are of this Belief.

* Pag. 27, 28. But yet ſince our Author reminds us; "* *That a-*
"*gainſt theſe no Argument taken from our Senſes or*
† *Sic* Treat. 1. p. 14. "*Reaſon is valid*: I will beg leave to remind him of his own Aſſertion too, † "That none can believe a
"Thing

"Thing true upon WHAT MOTIVE SOEVER, that he "knows certainly to be *falſe*, or which is all one, cer- "tainly to *contradict*——So that IF OUR REASON THEN "MAKES US CERTAIN OF SUCH A CONTRADICTION, "WE MAY BE CERTAIN THAT THERE NEITHER IS "NOR CAN BE A CONTRARY REVELATION; and "when any *Revelation*, tho *NEVER SO* "*PLAIN*, is brought, *we are* BOUND *to* "*interpret it ſo, as not to affirm a certainly known* "*Impoſſibility*. P. 21. Treat. 1.

From which Principle it ſeems to me to follow, that were *Hoc eſt Corpus meum*, as evident a proof of *Tranſubſtantiation*, as their own Authors confeſs it is not; yet if our SENSE and REASON tell us that there are certain CONTRADICTIONS againſt the common *Principles* of *Nature*, and the *univerſal Sentiments* of all Mankind, no otherwiſe to be avoided but by taking thoſe Words in the *Senſe* in which we do; we are then *BOUND* to interpret them ſo, as to avoid theſe *Impoſſibilities*. And this I am confident I have at large ſhewn above to be the Caſe, and thither I refer the *Reader*.

II. *Ground*. Their ſecond Ground is founded upon the *Authority* of thoſe *Councils* that have determined this Matter; "The Declaration, *as he calls it*, of the "moſt *Supream* and *Univerſal Church-Authority* that "hath been aſſembled in former Times for the deci- "ſion of this *Controverſy*, long before the birth of "*Proteſtantiſm*. P. 28. §. XXV.

Theſe are great Words indeed; but I wonder who ever heard before that a few miſerable * *Synods* of particular Prelats, ſuch as are all thoſe to which he refers us, aſſembled againſt *Berengarius*, were *the* "*moſt*

* Theſe are his Synods; at *Rome*, *Vercelles*, *Tours*; *Rome* again, *An.* 1059. and again, *An.* 1078.

moſt ſupream and univerſal Church-Authority. For his little Reflection, that they were aſſembled long before the birth of *Proteſtantiſm*, I muſt tell him, I doubt he is miſtaken. The Religion of *Proteſtants*, like that of *Papiſts*, is compos'd of two great Parts; *Catholick Chriſtianity*, common in ſome meaſure to us all; and *Proteſtations againſt Popery*. Now 'tis true, for what concerns the latter of theſe, we allow *Popery* to have the advantage of us, as to the Point of *Antiquity*, nor are we aſhamed to own it: It being neceſſary that they ſhould have fallen into *Errors*, before we could *proteſt* againſt *them*; but as to the preſent matter, our Author in his * *Guide*, to which he refers us, confeſſes that *Berengarius*, againſt whom theſe little *Synods* were called, proceeded upon *Proteſtant Grounds, i. e.* in effect was a *Proteſtant* as to this Point: And therefore 'tis falſe in him now to ſay, that theſe Councils were *aſſembled long before the birth of Proteſtantiſm.*

* Diſc. 1. p. 55. §. lvii.

But I return to his Church-Authority; and anſwer; 1. If this Doctrine be certainly contrary to *Senſe* and *Reaſon*, as was before ſaid, then he has told us before, that "*no Motive whatever, no Revela-*" *tion, tho never ſo plain, can be ſufficient to engage us* "*to believe it.* 2. For his *Councils*, the eldeſt of them was above a thouſand Years after Chriſt, when by our own Confeſſion, the Error, tho not of *Tranſubſtantiation*, yet of the *Corporal Preſence*, was creeping into the Church. 3. Theſe *Councils* were themſelves a *Party* againſt *Berengarius*, and therefore no wonder if they condemned him. 4. They were neither *univerſal* of the whole Chucrh, or even of the *Weſtern Patriarchate* in which they aſſembled; and therefore we can have no ſecurity that they did not err,

err, tho we ſhould grant this Privileg to a truly *General Council* that it could not. 5. 'Tis evident that ſome of them did err; foraſmuch as the very * *Formularies* of Recantation preſcribed to *Berengarius*, do not agree the one with the other; and one of them was ſuch, that their own † Authors tell us it muſt be *very favourably interpreted, or it will lead us into a worſer Error than that which is condemn'd.* 6. Were they never ſo infallible, yet they none of them defined *Tranſubſtantiation*, but only a *Corporal Preſence*; and ſo whatever *Authority* they have, it is for the *Lutherans*, not the *Papiſts*. 7. And this their own Writers ſeem to own; foraſmuch as none of them pretend to any *definition* of *Tranſubſtantiation* before the *Council* of *Lateran*; and till which time they freely confeſs it was no *Article of Faith.*

* *In the firſt* Formulary *preſcribed him by* P. Nicholas 2. *in the Synod of* Rome, 1059. *He thus declares,* Panem & Vinum quæ in altari ponuntur poſt conſecrationem non ſolum Sacramentum ſed etiam verum Corpus & Sanguinem, D. N. J. Chriſti eſſe; & ſenſualiter non ſolùm SACRAMENTO, ſed in Veritate manibus Sacerdotum, tractari, frangi, & fidelium dentibus atteri. *The former Part of which Confeſſion is* Lutheran; *the latter utterly deny'd by the* C. *of* R. *at this Day. In the ſecond Formulary preſcribed him by* Gregory viith, 1078. Confiteor Panem & Vinum——converti in veram ac propriam Carnem & Sanguinem J. C. D. N. Et poſt conſecrationem eſſe verum Corpus Chriſti——non tantùm per ſignum & virtutem Sacramenti, ſed in proprietate naturæ, & veritate ſubſtantiæ. *This ſpeaks of a Converſion, but of what kind it ſays not*; *and* Lombard *and the other Schoolmen, to the very time of the Council of* Lateran, *were not agreed about it: and P.* Gregory *himſelf in his MS. Work upon St.* Mat. *knew not what to think of it.* † Jo. Semeca ad Can. Ego Berengar. not. ad Jus Canon. " Niſi ſanè " intelligas verba Berengarii in majorem incides Hæreſim quam ipſe habuit; & ideò omnia referas ad ſpecies ipſas; nam de Chriſti Corpore partes non facimus. *So* Hervæus *in* 4. diſt. qu. 1. art. 1. *ſays, that to ſpeak the more expreſly againſt the Hereticks, he declined a little too much to the oppoſite ſide. So* Ricardus de Media Villa in 4. diſt. princip. 1. qu. 1. Berengarius fuerat infamatus quòd non credebat Corpus Chriſti realiter contineri ſub pane, ideò ad ſui purgationem, *per verba exceſſiva contrarium Aſſeruit.*

Such is the Church-Authority which this *Diſcourſer* would put upon us. But now that I have mentioned the *Council* of *Lateran*, as I have before obſerved, that it was the ſame Council which eſta- Pag. 28.

bliſh'd

bliſh'd this Error, that alſo gave power to the *Pope* to *depoſe Princes*, and *abſolve their Subjects from their Obedience*; ſo I cannot but remark further in this place, the *Zeal* of our *Author* in the *defence* of its *Authority*. It is but a very little while ſince another of the *Church*, ‖ Father *Walſh*, in his Letter to the Biſhop of *Lincoln*, did not think that the * Learned Perſon of our Church, to whom he refers us, had ſo clearly proved theſe *Canons* to have been the genuine † *Acts* either of the *Council*, or even of the *Papiſt* himſelf, but that a Man might ſtill have reaſon to doubt of both: But indeed, tho that *Father* be of another Mould, yet there are ſtill ſome in the World, and I believe of this *Author*'s Acquaintance, who like this *Council* never the worſe for ſuch a *deciſion*; but think the third *Canon* as neceſſary to keep *Princes* in a due *Obedience* to the *Church*, as the firſt, *de Fide Catholicâ*, to help out the obſcurity of the Text in favour of *Tranſubſtantiation*.

‖ Lond. 1615. Pag. 362, &c.

* *Mr.* Dodwel *Conſid. of preſent Concernment*, §. 31.

† *Monſieur* du Pin *utterly denies theſe* Canons *to have been the* Decrees *of the* Council. Diſſert. vii. c. iii. §. 4.

Pag. 28, 29. §. xxv.

But he goes on; and upon theſe Premſes, " Asks " us, What more *reaſonable* or *ſecure* courſe in mat- " ters of Religion can a private and truly humble " Chriſtian take, than where the ſenſe of a *Divine* " *Revelation* is diſputed, to ſubmit to that Interpre- " tation thereof, which *the Supreameſt Authority in* " *the Church*, that hath heretofore been convened a- " bout ſuch matters, hath ſo *often*, and *always in the* " *ſame manner* decided to him, and ſo to act according " to its Injunction?

Now, not to ſay any more as to his Expreſſion of the *Supreameſt Church-Authority*, which it may be he will interpret not *abſolutely*, but with this *Reſerve*, *that hath been convened about ſuch matters*; I anſwer from himſelf, 1. It is a more *reaſonable* and *ſecure* *courſe*

Courſe to follow that *Interpretation* which is agreeable to the *common Senſe* and *Reaſon* of Mankind, and againſt which he tells us, not only the *Authority* of a *Synod*, but even a *Divine Revelation* is not ſufficient to ſecure us. 2. Theſe *Synods*, as I have ſhewed, beſides that they were *particular*, were moreover *Parties* in the caſe. And then, 3. It is falſe to ſay that they always decided the *ſame*, or, that that which they decided is the *ſame* which the *Church of Rome* now holds in this matter. All which our * Authors have fully proved, and this *Diſcourſer* therefore ought to have anſwered.

* *Particularly* Blondel, *to whom this Author refers us*, Eclairciſſ. de l'Euch. c. 20, *&c.* Albertinus de Euch. lib. 3. p. 947.

III. *Ground.* "But now, *he ſays*, if theſe Coun- P. 29. §. xxvi.
"cils be declined, as not being ſo ancient as ſome
"may expect; *i. e.* not held before ſome Contro-
"verſy happen'd in the Church touching the Point
"they decided: They have yet another *very rational*
"*Ground* of their belief, and that is, the evident Te-
"ſtimony of the *more Primitive Times*. It would have been more to the purpoſe, if he could honeſtly have ſaid of the *moſt Primitive Times*. But however his Modeſty is the greater now, tho this Argument be not ſo ſtrong. As to the Point of *Antiquity*, I have already fully diſcuſſed it above; and we are but very lately aſſured by one of their own *Authors*, that *Antiquity* is of our ſide in this Point. For the ſix or ſeven Fathers he has mentioned, ‖ ſome of them are *ſpurious*; others have been † expreſly anſwered by us; and all of them at large by Monſieur *Aubertine*, *Larrogue*, and others. If this does not

Treatiſe of Tranſubſtantiation, by an Author of the C. of R.

‖ S. Ambroſe de Sacramentis. Euſeb. Emyſſen. de Paſchate.

† Cyril Hieroſol. *in the Relat. of the Conference at my Lady* T. 1676. *in the Paper ſent my Lady* T. p. 50, 51, 52. *And for* S. Ambroſe de Sacr. *allowing the Book; yet ſee the Explication of what is there ſaid, given by himſelf*, l. 5. c. 4. *See a late Treatiſe of the Doct. of the Trinity and Tranſubſt. compared*, Part 1. p. 46, 47.

ſatisfy him, he may ſhortly expect a fuller account in our own Language; * a *Specimen* of which has already been given to the World in Earneſt of what is ſuddenly to follow.

* *Tranſubſtantiation no Doctrine of the Primitive Fathers.* Cyrill's *Authority examined*, p. 13, 14. Ambroſe's, p. 18, 19. Chryſoſtom's, p. 40. Greg. Nyſſen's, p. 48.

IV. *Ground.* His next *Ground* is taken "from "the univerſal Doctrine and Practice of the latter "both *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Churches till *Luther*'s "Time, and at preſent alſo excepting his Followers. To which I anſwer; That this *Ground* is not *certainly true*, and if it were, yet *certainly 'tis nothing to the purpoſe.* 1. *It is not certainly true:* Indeed, that the latter Ages of the *Weſtern Churches* before *Luther*, that is, from the time of the Council of *Lateran*, did profeſs the belief of *Tranſubſtantiation* is confeſs'd: And that a great part of the *Greek Church* at this day do's the ſame, ſince their new *Colledge* at *Rome*, and their *Mony* and *Miſſionaries* ſent among them have corrupted their Faith, I do not deny: But that this was ſo before *Luther* is not ſo certain; and whoſoever ſhall impartially read over the long debate between the late Monſieur *Claude*, and Monſieur *Arnaud* concerning this matter, will, I believe, confeſs that this can be no *rational Ground* for their belief. *I. Ludolphus* tell us of the *Ethiopian* Church, that at this day, it neither believes *Tranſubſtantiation*, nor yet *Adores the Hoſt:* and *Tellezius* confeſſes it, becauſe they conſecrate with theſe words, "*This Bread is my Body:* For the * *Greeks*, the *Muſcovites*, the *Armenians*, the *Neſtorians*, *Maronites*, &c.

Hiſt. Ethiop. l. 3. c. 5. n. 48.

Ibid.

* De Eccleſ. Græc. Stat. Hodiern. D. Smith. p. 116. Lond. 1678. Claude Reſponſe au 2. Traitte; liv. 3. c. 8. p. 434, *&c.* Charenton. 1668. Id ult. reſp. à Quevilly 1670. lib. 5. c. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Hiſtoire Critique de la creance & des Coutumes, des Nations, du Levant.—Voyage du Mont Liban. Remarques, p. 302, 303, *&c.* Larrogue Hiſt. de l'Eucheriſte, liv. 2. c. 19. p. 781. Edit. Amſt. 12*o.* Albertinus de Euchariſtiâ, p. 988, 989. fol. Daventriæ, 1654.

thoſe

thoſe who pleaſe to intereſt their Curioſity in a matter of ſo little moment as to their Faith, may ſatisfy themſelves in the Authors, to which I refer them. Tho now, 2. To allow the matter of Fact to be true, I pray, what force is there at laſt in this Argument, "The Church both Eaſtern and Weſtern, "in theſe laſt Ages have believed *Tranſubſtantiation*; "therefore the *Papiſts* have a *rational Ground* to be- "lieve it. That is to ſay, you *Proteſtants* charge us for believing *Tranſubſtantiation*, as Men that act contrary to the deſign of Chriſt in this *Holy Euchariſt*, that have forſaken the *Tradition* of the *Primitives Ages* of the *Church*; that deſtroy the nature of this *Holy Sacrament*, and do violence to the common *Senſe* and *Reaſon* of Mankind: Be it ſo; yet at leaſt we have this *rational Ground* for our belief, tho it ſhould be falſe, *viz.* That we did all of us peaceably and quietly believe it, till you came with your *Scripture*, and *Antiquity*, and *Senſe*, and *Reaſon*, to raiſe Doubts and Difficulties about it; nay more, we all of us ſtill do believe it, except thoſe that you have perſwaded not to do ſo.

Spectatum admiſſi riſum teneatis Amici?

V. *Ground.* Of no greater ſtrength is his laſt *Ground* for their belief, *viz.*, "That ſince *Luther*'s "Time no ſmall number of *Proteſtants*, even all the "*Genuine Sons* of the *Church* of *England*, have pro- "ceeded thus far, as to confeſs a *Real Preſence* of "our Lord's *Body* and *Blood* in the *Euchariſt*, and "*Adoration* of it, as preſent there. For, 1. If we did *acknowledg* this, yet it ſeems we are miſtaken in it; and then what grounds can it be for a *Papiſt* to P. 31. §. xxviii.

believe *Tranſubſtantiation*, that we *Hereticks* by a Miſtake do not believe it, but only a *real ſpiritual Preſence*, and as ſuch are *Anathematized* by them for our Error? 2. I have before ſhewn, that were this a *rational Ground*, yet it fails them too; for neither do the *Genuine Sons* of the *Church* of *England*, nor any other that I know of, either believe Chriſt's *natural Body* to be ſubſtantially preſent in the Holy *Euchariſt*, or to be *adored* there: I am ſure if there be any ſuch, they cannot be the *Genuine Sons* of the *Church* of *England* in this Matter, who believe ſo expreſly contrary to her formal Declaration, as this Author has himſelf obſerved.

Ibid. Pag. 32. And then for the *Lutherans*, to whom he again returns; it is hard to conceive what *rational ground* of Security they can derive from their practice; that becauſe they commit no *Idolatry* in worſhipping what they know certainly to be Chriſt, the *Papiſt* commits none for worſhipping what he do's not know certainly is Chriſt; in truth what, if he pleaſed, he might know certainly is not Chriſt.

And now after a ſerious and impartial Conſideration of the Grounds produced in Vindication of this *Worſhip*; tho I could have wiſh'd I might have found them as *rational* as our Author pretends them to be, and ſhall be glad, as they are, that they may hereafter prove ſufficient to excuſe them from the Guilt of *formal Idolatry* in this *Adoration*; yet I muſt needs ſay, I do in my Conſcience think 'tis more

P. 33. §. xxx. "an exceſs of *Charity*, than any neceſſity of Argu-
"ment, if our *Writers* do ſometimes, either not
"at all, or but faintly, charge them with *Idolatry*.
And the Teſtimonies he produces, argue rather the candor of our Affections towards them, even ſuch

as

as to hope, almoſt againſt Hope for their ſakes; than give any ſecurity to them in their Errors. And becauſe I would willingly, if poſſible, convince them of it, I will very briefly ſubjoin a Reaſon or two.

2*dly*; Why even upon their own *Principles* I am not ſatisfied that they have ſuch a *rational Ground* for this *Adoration*, as may be ſufficient to excuſe them.

For, 1*ſt*, It is granted by this Author, "That a "meerly *good Intention* grounded upon a *culpable Ig-* "*norance*, cannot excuſe them from *Idolatry*. So that if their *ignorance* then be really *culpable*, their *good Intention* will not be ſufficient to excuſe them. Now the *ignorance* upon which this practice is founded, is their miſtaken interpretation of thoſe words, *This is my Body*; and whether that be a *rational* or *culpable* Miſtake, we ſhall beſt be able to judg by two or three Obſervations. P. 26. §. xxii.

1. It is confeſs'd by the greateſt Men of their Church, that there is *no neceſſity* to interpret thoſe words in that manner that they do; ſo that had not the Authority of their Church interpoſed, they might have been *equally verified* in our Interpretation. And this muſt be allow'd, unleſs we ſhall ſay, that all places of Holy Scripture muſt be underſtood in a *literal ſenſe*, whatever the Conſequence be of ſo doing.

2. Our Author himſelf confeſſes, that if the taking of them in the *literal ſenſe* do's involve a *certain Contradiction*, then it cannot be right; but we are *bound* to ſeek out ſome other Expoſition to avoid a *certain Contradiction*.

3. It

3. It is undeniable, that their Interpretation of theſe words deſtroys the certainty of *Senſe*, and in that of the Truth of the *Chriſtian Religion*, which was confirmed by *Miracles*, known only by the *evidence* of *Senſe*; and by Conſequence of this particular Point, that *Tranſubſtantiation* is revealed to us by God, or can be rely'd upon as coming from him.

Now from theſe Principles I thus argue: If that *ſenſe* of theſe words, *This is my Body*, upon which they ground their *Adoration*, do's neceſſarily imply many plain and certain *Contradictions*, then by their own Confeſſion that cannot be the right *ſenſe* of them. But that it do's ſo, and that without groſs and culpable *Ignorance* they cannot doubt of but know it, I thus ſhew. He that believes theſe words in the ſenſe of *Tranſubſtantiation*, muſt believe the ſame *natural Body*, at the ſame time, to be in ten-thouſand ſeveral places upon Earth, and yet ſtill to be but *one Body*, and that all the While in Heaven: He muſt believe that the ſame *natural Body* is at the ſame time *extended* in all its Parts, and yet continuing ſtill the *ſame Body* without any change, to be *unextended*, and have no diſtinct Parts, nor be capable of being divided into any: He muſt believe the ſame *Body* at the ſame time, to move, and to lie ſtill: to be the Object our Senſes, and yet not to be perceptible by any: With infinite others of the like kind * as I have more fully ſhewn before. But now all theſe are groſs *Contradictions*, contrary to the *Nature* of a *Body*, and to the common *Principles* of *Reaſon* in all Mankind; and no Man can, without *culpable Ignorance* pretend not to know them to be ſo: And therefore, notwithſtanding any ſuch ſuppoſed *Divine Revelation* as may be pretended from thoſe words,

* See above, Ch. 2. of *Tranſubſtantiation*. Pag. 32, 33.

words, *This is my Body*, they cannot, by our Author's own *Rule*, without *culpable Ignorance*, not know that they are miſtaken in this Matter.

Again: No *Papiſt* can have any reaſon to believe *Tranſubſtantiation* to be true, but becauſe he reads thoſe words of Holy Scripture, *This is my Body*. That theſe words are in Scripture, he can know only by his *Senſes*: If his *Senſes* therefore are not to be truſted, he is not ſure there are any ſuch words in Scripture. If they are to be truſted, he is then ſure that the *Interpretation* which he puts upon them muſt be *falſe*.

Since then it is confeſs'd, that there is *no neceſſity* to underſtand thoſe words in a *literal ſenſe*; and that both upon the account of the *Contradictions* that ſuch an Expoſition involves to the *common Principles of Reaſon*, and to the certain *Evidence of the Senſes of all Mankind*, it is neceſſary to take them in ſome other meaning, it remains that without groſs and *culpable Ignorance* they cannot pretend not to know, that this could never have been the intention of our Bleſſed Saviour in thoſe *words*; and that ſuch *Ignorance* will not *excuſe* them, our Author himſelf has freely confeſs'd.

But, 2*dly*, let us quit this Reflection, and for once ſuppoſe the poſſibility of *Tranſubſtantiation*. Yet ſtill it is confeſs'd by them: 1. That there is no Command nor Example in holy Scripture for *adoring* Chriſt in the *Euchariſt*. 2. That infinite Defects may happen to hinder him from being there; and then what they *worſhip* is only a piece of *Bread*. 3. That they can never be ſure that ſome of theſe *Defects* have not happened; and by conſequence, that what they ſuppoſe to be *Chriſt's Body*, is indeed any more than a *meer Wafer*.

From

From whence I argue;

He that without any Command or Warrant of God, pays a *Divine Adoration* to that which he can never be ſure is more than a *meer Creature*, can never be ſure that he do's not commit *Idolatry*: But whoſoever worſhips the *Hoſt*, worſhips that which he can never be ſure is more than a *meer Creature*; and therefore he can never be ſure that in ſo doing he do's not commit *Idolatry*.

Now concerning the former of theſe, how dangerous it is for any one to give *Divine Worſhip* to what he can never be ſure is any more than a *meer Creature*, be it conſidered, what *jealouſy* God has at all times expreſs'd of his *Honour* as to this Matter; how ſtrict he has been in the peculiar vindication of his Supreme *Prerogative* in ſuch Caſes. How therefore he that will come to Him, muſt be very well aſſured that it is God to whom he approaches; and therefore if he has but the leaſt reaſon to *doubt* of it, ought not to worſhip with a *doubting Mind*; becauſe he ought not to do that, the *omitting* whereof can be no *fault*, but the *doing* of which may, for ought he knows, be a very great *Sin*.

And for the ſecond; Whether every *Roman Catholick*, who *adores* the *Hoſt*, has not even upon his own *Principles*, very great cauſe to doubt, whether he *adores* Chriſt's *Body*, or only a bit of *Bread*, will appear from thoſe infinite Defects which they themſelves allow as ſufficient to hinder a *Conſecration*; and which make it great odds, were their Doctrine otherwiſe never ſo true, whether yet one *Hoſt* in twenty, it may be in five hundred, be conſecrated.

1. With reference to the Holy *Elements* to be conſecrated: If the *Bread* be not all, or at leaſt the greater

ter part, of *Wheat-flower*; if it be not *mix'd* with *pure Water*; if the *Bread* be corrupted, or the *Wine* ſour; if the *Grapes* of which the *Wine* was made were not *ripe*; if any thing be *mingled* with the *Wine* but *Water*, or if there be ſo much *Water* mix'd with it, that that becomes the prevailing Ingredient; in all theſe Caſes, and many others which I omit, there is no *Conſecration*. And of all this, he who *adores* either the *Bread* or *Wine*, can have no ſecurity. But,

See all this in the beginning of the Miſſal, De defectibus circa Miſſam.

2. Be the Elements right, yet if the Prieſt, being either ignorant, or in haſte, or unmindful of what he is about, ſhould by miſtake, or otherwiſe, err in pronouncing of *the Words of Conſecration*; whether by *Addition*, or by *Diminution*, or by any other *Alteration*, there is no *Conſecration*: The *Bread* and *Wine* continue what they were; and of this too he that worſhips them can never be certain.

3. Let the Words be never ſo rightly pronounced, yet if the Prieſt had *no intention to conſecrate*; if he be a ſecret *Atheiſt*, or *Jew*, or *Moor*: If he be a careleſs negligent Man; it may be does not believe he has any Power to make ſuch a Change, (as I have ſhewn that ſeveral of their greateſt Men in this very *Age* have doubted of it): If he conſecrate a number of *Wafers* for a *Communion*, and in his telling, miſtakes, intending to conſecrate but *Twenty*, and there are *one and twenty* before him; in all theſe *Caſes*, for want of a *due intention* in the *Prieſt*, there is no *Conſecration*; but that which is *adored*, is only a little *Bread* and *Wine*.

4. Let the *Prieſt* have a good *Intention*, yet if he be *no Prieſt*; if he were not rightly Baptized, or Ordained; if he were a Simoniac, or Irregular, or

See above in the Preface.

a Baſtard, *&c.* Or if there were no defect in his *Ordination*, yet if there was any in his who *ordained* him; or in the *Biſhops* that *ordained* that *Biſhop* that *ordained* him; and ſo back to the very Time of the *Apoſtles*, if in the whole Succeſſion of Prieſts to this Day, there has been but any *one Invalidity*, whether by Error or Wilfulneſs, or for want of a due Intention, or by Ignorance, or by any other means; then he that *conſecrates* is no true *Prieſt*, and by conſequence has no Power to *conſecrate*; and ſo all is ſpoiled, and whoſoever *worſhips* in any of his *Maſſes*, *adores* only a piece of *Bread* inſtead of our Saviour's *Body*.

When therefore ſo many *Defects* may interpoſe upon their own Principles to hinder this *Converſion*, that 'tis exceeding probable, nay 'tis really great odds, that not one *Hoſt* in twenty is conſecrated; it muſt certainly be very hazardous to worſhip that for God, which upon their own *Principles* they can never be ſure is ſo; nay, which 'tis twenty to one is not *God*, but a meer inanimate Creature of *Bread* and *Wine*.

'Tis this has forced their moſt * Learned Men to confeſs, that they can never be *ſure* of a *Conſecration*; and our Author himſelf to declare, "That they "do not worſhip the Subſtance that is under the Ac- "cidents of *Bread* and *Wine*, *WHATEVER IT BE*, "but *UPON SUPPOSITION* that it is *CHRIST'S* "*BODY*; Which is what Pope *Adrian 6th*, following herein the Authority of the Council of *Conſtance*, preſcribed; that they ought always to *adore* the *Hoſt* with ſuch a Reſerve: "The Council of *Conſtance*, "*ſays he*, excuſes thoſe who in their ſimplicity *adore* "an *unconſecrated Hoſt*, becauſe this condition is tacitly

* *Su* Bellarm. de Juſtif. c. 8.

Pag. 23.

Adr. VI. quodlibet. Sect. 10. Suppoſ. 2.

Su Gerſon, Tract. de Exam. doctr. conſid. 6.

" citly implied, *if it be rightly conſecrated:* And there-
" fore he adviſes, let them ſo adore the Hoſt, *I ADORE*
" *THEE IF THOU ART CHRIST.* But now if, as the Apoſtle tells us in another Caſe, *Whatſoever is not of Faith, is Sin*; and, *He that doubts, is damned if he eats:* I ſhall leave it to any ſober Chriſtian to ſay what ſecurity there can be in ſuch a *Worſhip*, which is neither adviſed, encouraged, or commanded in Holy Scripture; and which they themſelves confeſs they can never be certain is addreſſed to a right *Object*; and therefore are forced to ſuch Shifts and Reſerves, as were they once admitted, might make any other Creature in the World as warrantably *adorable* as their *Hoſt*.

How much better were it for them to *adore* their Bleſſed Saviour in *Heaven*, where his *glorified Body* moſt certainly is: Where there can therefore be no danger to *lift up our Hearts* unto him. Were his Sacred *Body* indeed *ſubſtantially preſent* in this Bleſſed *Sacrament*, yet ſtill it would be in a manner to us imperceptible, in the ſtate of his Death, and by conſequence of his Humiliation; and we might therefore have ſome cauſe to doubt whether, ſince we have received no Command concerning it, it were our Saviour's Pleaſure that his *Body* ſhould be *adored* by us in that State: So that there could be no Sin in the not doing of it. But now amidſt ſo many Doubts, not only upon Ours, but even upon their own Principles, that they dare not themſelves *worſhip at a venture*, that which yet they do *worſhip*; though I ſhall leave them to their own Maſter to ſtand or fall at the Great Day, yet I muſt needs profeſs I think there is very much hazard in it. A great Sincerity, and great Ignorance, may excuſe a poor untaught, and therefore *blindly obedient* Multitude: but for their *Guides*, who lead them into Error, for thoſe to whom

God has given Capacities and Opportunities (as to thoſe now among us he has done, of being better informed) I can only ſay, *Lord, lay not this Sin to their Charge!*

And this may ſuffice to have been ſaid to the third Thing propoſed, of their *Rational Grounds* for this Worſhip. For what our Author finally adds; "That "to *adore* that which the *Adorer* believes not to be our "*Lord*, but *Bread*, would be unlawful to be done by "any, ſo long as the Perſon continues ſo perſuaded—— "But then if we ſuppoſe the Church *juſtly* requiring "ſuch *Adoration* upon ſuch a *true Preſence* of our "Lord, neither will the ſame Perſon be free from ſin- "ning greatly in his following ſuch his Conſcience, and "in his not adoring.

Pag. 37. §. xxxiii.

I Anſwer: It will then be time enough to conſider this, when either the *Church* to which we owe an *Obedience*, ſhall require it of us, or they be able to prove that in ſuch a Caſe the *Church* would not *ſin* in *Commanding*, and not *we* in *refuſing* to *obey* her. But, bleſſed be God, there is no great danger of either of theſe: Our *Church* is too well perſwaded of the unlawfulneſs of ſuch a *Worſhip*, ever to require it of us. And for that *Church* which has ſo uncharitably undertaken to *Anathematize* all thoſe who will not own her *Authority*, and receive her Errors, though never ſo groſs, as Articles of Faith: We are ſo fully convinced of the unreaſonableneſs of her Pretences, and of our own Liberty, that we ſhall hardly be brought to ſubmit our ſelves to the Conduct of ſuch a *blind Guide*, leſt we fall into the ſame *Ditch*, into which ſhe her ſelf is tumbled. And it would certainly much better become our Author, and his Brethren, to conſider how they can juſtify their *Diſobedience* to their own *Mother*, than to en-

endeavour at this rate to lead us into the ſame *Apoſtacy*, both to our *Religion*, and our *Church* with them.

The Concluſion.

AND thus by the Bleſſing of God, and the Advantage of a good Cauſe, have I very briefly paſſed through this Author's *Reflections*, and I am perſuaded ſufficiently ſhewn the weakneſs and falſity of the moſt of them. If any one ſhall think that I ought to have inſiſted more largely upon ſome Points; he may pleaſe to know, that ſince by the importunate Provocations of thoſe of the *other Communion*, we have been forced too often to interrupt thoſe Duties of our *Miniſtry*, in which we could rather have wiſh'd to have employ'd our Time, for theſe kind of Controverſies which ſerve ſo very little to any purpoſes, either of true Piety, or true Charity among us: We have reſolved thus far at leaſt to gratify both our ſelves and others, as to make our *Diſputes* as *ſhort* as is poſſible; and loſe no more time in them, than the neceſſary Defence of our ſelves and the Truth do require.

I have indeed paſs'd by much of our Authors' *Diſcourſes*, becauſe they are almoſt entirely made up of tedious and endleſs *Repetitions* of the ſame things, and very often in the ſame Words. But for any thing that is Argumentative, or otherwiſe material to the main *Cauſe*, I do not know that I have either let the Obſervation of it ſlip, or diſſembled at all the Force of it.

It was once in my Thoughts to have made ſome Reflections in the Cloſe upon the *Changes* of their *Rituals*, in requital for our Author's Obſervations on the *Alterations* of our *Liturgie*; but I have inſiſted longer than

than I designed already, and shall therefore content my self to have given the Hint of what might have been done, and shall still be done, if our Author, or any in his behalf, desire it of me.

In the mean time I cannot but observe the unreasonableness of that *Method* which is here taken; from the Expressions of some of our Divines, and the Concessions of others, whose profess'd Business it was to reconcile, if possible, all Parties, and therefore were forced sometimes to condescend more than was fit for the doing it; and even these too miserably *mangled* and *misrepresented*, to pretend to prove the *Doctrine* of our *Church* contrary to the *express Declarations* of the *Publick Acts* and *Records* of it. This has been the endeavour of several of our late Writers, but of this *Discourser* above any. Had those Worthy Persons, whose Memory they thus abuse, been yet living, they might have had an ample Confutation from their own Pens; as, in the very Instance before us, has been given them for the like ill use made by some among them, of the pious *Meditations* of a most Excellent and Learned *Father* of our *Church*; and who might otherwise in the next Age have been improved into a new Witness against us. I do not think that Bp. *Taylour* ever thought he should have been set up as a Favourer of *Popery*, who had written so expressly and warmly against it. Yet I cannot but observe a kind of Prophetick Expression in his Book of the *Real Presence*, which being so often quoted by these Men, I somewhat wonder it should have slipp'd their Remark: Where speaking of their Shifts to make any One they please of their Side, he has these Words; "And——I know no reason, *says he*, but it may be possible, but a WITTY MAN may pretend, when I am dead, that in this

Real Presence, §. xii. n. 28. pag. 261.

"*Dis-*

" *Diſcourſe* I have pleaded for the *Doctrine* of the *Ro-*
" *man Church.*

We have now lived to ſee ſome of thoſe WITTY MEN that have done but little leſs than this; tho how *Honeſt* they are in the mean time, I will not determine. But I hope this Deſign too ſhall be from henceforth in good meaſure fruſtrated: And therefore, ſince neither their *New Religion*, nor their *New Advocates* will do their Buſineſs; ſince it is in vain that they either *miſrepreſent* their own *Doctrine*, or our *Authors* in favour of it; may they once pleaſe either honeſtly to avow and defend their Faith, or honeſtly to confeſs that they cannot do it. Such ſhuffling as this, does but more convince us of the *weakneſs* of their *Cauſe*; and inſtead of defending their *Religion* by theſe Practices, they only encreaſe in us our *ill Opinion* of that, and leſſen that *good One* which we willingly would, but ſhall not always be able to conſerve of *thoſe*, who by ſuch indirect means as theſe endeavour to ſupport it.

FINIS.

Books lately printed for Richard Chiſwell.

A Diſſertation concerning the Government of the *Ancient Church*: more particularly of the Encroachments of the *Biſhops of Rome* upon other *Sees*. By *WILLIAM CAVE*, D. D. *Octavo*.

An Anſwer to Mr. *Sergeant's* [Sure Footing in Chriſtianity] concerning the Rule of Faith: With ſome other Diſcourſes. By *WILLIAM FALKNER*, D.D. *4o*.

A Vindication of the Ordinations of the *Church of England*; in Anſwer to a Paper written by one of the *Church of Rome*, to prove the Nullity of our Orders. By *GILBERT BURNET*, D. D. *Octavo*.

An Abridgment of the Hiſtory of the Reformation of the *Church of England*. By *GILB. BURNET*, D. D. *Octavo*.

The APOLOGY of the *Church of England*; and an Epiſtle to one Signior *Scipio*, a *Venetian* Gentleman, concerning the Council of *Trent*, Written both in Latin, by the Right Reverend Father in God, *JOHN JEWEL* Lord Biſhop of *Sarisbury*: Made Engliſh by a Perſon of Quality. To which is added, The Life of the ſaid Biſhop: Collected and written by the ſame Hand. *Octavo*.

The Life of *WILLIAM BEDEL*, D. D. Biſhop of *Kilmore* in *Ireland*. Together with *Certain Letters* which paſſed betwixt him and *James Waddiſworth* (a late Penſioner of the Holy Inquiſition of *Spain*) in Matter of Religion, concerning the General Motives to the *Roman Obedience*. *Octavo*.

The Decree made at *ROME* the Second of *March*, 1679. condemning ſome Opinions of the *Jeſuits*, and other *caſuiſts*. *Quarto*.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Neceſſity of Reformation, with reſpect to the Errors and Corruptions of the *Church of Rome*. *Quarto*. Firſt and Second Parts.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Celebration of Divine Service in an Unknown Tongue. *Quarto*.

A Papiſt not Miſrepreſented by Proteſtants. Being a Reply to the Reflections upon the Anſwer to [A Papiſt Miſrepreſented and Repreſented]. *Quarto*.

An Expoſition of the Doctrine of the *Church of England*, in the ſeveral Articles propoſed by the late BISHOP of *CONDOM*, [in his Expoſition of the Doctrine of the *Catholick Church*]. *Quarto*.

A Defence of the Expoſition of the Doctrine of the *Church of England*; againſt the Exceptions of Monſieur de *Meaux*, late Biſhop of *Condon*, and his Vindicator. *4o*.

A *CATECHISM* explaining the Doctrine and Practices of the *Church of Rome*. With an Anſwer thereunto. By a *Proteſtant* of the *Church of England*. *8o*.

A Papiſt Repreſented and not Miſrepreſented, being an Anſwer to the Firſt, Second, Fifth and Sixth Sheets of the Second Part of the [Papiſt Miſrepreſented and Repreſented]; and for a further Vindication of the *CATECHISM*, truly repreſenting the Doctrines and Practices of the *Church of Rome*. *Quarto*.

The *Lay-Chriſtian's* Obligation to read the Holy Scriptures. *Quarto*.

The *Plain Man's* Reply to the *Catholick Miſſionaries*. *24o*.

An Anſwer to *THREE PAPERS* lately printed, concerning the Authority of the *Catholick Church* in Matters of Faith, and the Reformation of the *Church of England*. *Quarto*.

A Vindication of the Anſwer to THREE PAPERS concerning the Unity and Authority of the *Catholick Church*, and the Reformation of the *Church of England*. *Quarto*.